

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1403425



The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA 91711

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

A STUDY OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, . . .	\$0 60
EVOLUTION OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES, . . .	100
MANUAL OF METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH HISTORY,	175
INTERROGATORY STUDIES IN BIBLE HIS- TORY,	75

BX
6195
C8

ARMINIANISM IN HISTORY;
"
OR,

The Revolt from Predestinationism.

BY

GEO. L. CURTISS, M. D., D. D.,

Professor of Historical Theology in the School of Theology
of DePauw University.



CINCINNATI: CRANSTON & CURTS.

NEW YORK: HUNT & EATON.

1894.

COPYRIGHT
BY CRANSTON & CURTS.

1894.

PREFACE.

WHEN it became necessary to give a class in Historical Theology a careful view of Arminianism in its historical as well as doctrinal character, I found material for such a study, but it was undigested, ill-arranged, and very unsatisfactory. After a careful search I failed to find a book on the subject that could be recommended to students. A copy of Brandt's "Life of James Arminius" could not be found, though a large dealer advertised at times for a year for it. Only recently I ran across it in an old French second-hand bookstore in New Orleans. Driven to gather and arrange such material as could be obtained, there resulted these chapters in the form of lectures, which were delivered to the class, discussed, revised, and delivered a second time. After this they were re-written and put in the present form, and a third time delivered to thoughtful men.

At the request of those who heard them, they are now offered to the public in this form. They

do not profess to be an exhaustive treatment of the history of Arminianism, but to make such a fair and clear presentation as shall lead young Methodists to a knowledge of what Arminianism is, what it has had to contend with in the struggle for existence, why Methodism is Arminian and not Calvinian, a part of the reason why Methodism has had such remarkable moral and spiritual victories, and what triumphs there are in store for Arminian Methodism as “Christianity in earnest” in the years to come?

GEO. L. CURTISS.

DEPAUW UNIVERSITY, 1894.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE.
WHAT IS ARMINIANISM,	7

CHAPTER II.

ARMINIUS AS PROFESSOR AT LEYDEN,	32
--	----

CHAPTER III.

ARMINIAN LEADERS,	51
-----------------------------	----

CHAPTER IV.

ARMINIAN WRITERS,	73
-----------------------------	----

CHAPTER V.

DOCTRINAL CONTROVERSIES,	93
------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER VI.

PRE-WESLEYAN ARMINIANISM IN EUROPE,	118
---	-----

CHAPTER VII.

THE POLITICAL HOME OF ARMINIANISM,	139
--	-----

CHAPTER VIII.

ARMINIANISM IN ITS WESLEYAN GROWTH,	156
---	-----

CHAPTER IX.

SCHOLARS OF ARMINIANISM,	179
------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER X.

	PAGE.
ARMINIANISM AND THE FRIENDS,	200

CHAPTER XI.

ARMINIANISM AND REVIVALS,	209
-------------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX,	221
---------------------	-----

INDEX,	227
------------------	-----

ARMINIANISM IN HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

WHAT IS ARMINIANISM?

Epochs in History—Discussions of Doctrines and Polity—Spread of Predestinationism—Calvinism, Arminianism, and Universalism—A Particular Statement of Arminianism—Original Sin as taught by Arminius—Arminianism not a New Doctrine as taught by Arminius—Augustine and Predestination to Eternal Life—Gottschalk and Foreordination to Damnation—James Arminius—Birth—Death of his Father—Adopted by Æmilius—At School at Utrecht—Death of Æmilius—Adopted by Suellius—At Marburg—Murder of his Mother, Sisters, and Brother at Oudewater—At Rotterdam—Sent to Leyden—A Brilliant Student—Adopted by the Burgomeisters of Amsterdam—Sent to Geneva—Forms the Acquaintance of Uytenbogaert—Went to Basle and studied for a Time—Went to Padua—Heard Zarabella Visited Rome—Called to Amsterdam—Examined by the Classis—Commenced Preaching—How Arminius came to adopt the Doctrine called by his Name—Koornhert to be refuted—Arminius chosen for the Task—The Examination led to his Repudiation of Predestination—Married—Public Exposition of Romans—Criticism and Slander—His Traducers—His Defense—The Senators decide in his Favor.

THE distinct and vigorous promulgation of important doctrines of Christianity, and their working like leaven among the people, produce epochs in

history. This is especially true if the doctrine chance to antagonize some old and favorite doctrine of the Church, or some branch, and runs counter to the preconceived notions of any considerable number of men. The most remarkable discussions that the world has ever heard, and which have produced the most marked effects upon events in history, both in individuals and in nations, are those about Christian doctrine and Church government. The best talent, the greatest learning, the highest degree of enthusiasm, and, at the same time, the most wonderful endurance have been brought into the discussions of doctrines and polity in whatever age. If there has been mingled in the discussions of Christian doctrine any political question, the results have entirely changed the face of history.

When Arminianism was promulgated in Holland at the Synod of Dort, Calvinism was the dominant doctrine regarding original sin, freedom of the will, and God's decrees concerning human salvation. For a full thousand years it held sway over the masses of the people under the name of Augustinism, and when some enlightened ecclesiastics presumed to controvert and deny the truth of the dogma, and proceeded to demonstrate its fallacy from Scripture and logic, then arose agitations in the Reformed Church world of so persistent a character as to affect schools, agitate Churches, and, sometimes, to involve nations. Such a hold had

this doctrine of the eternal decrees taken upon men that they came to question the right of any one to doubt the truth of the dogmas of Calvinism. It had taken hold upon the State, and stamped itself upon the Government of Geneva, dictated its constitution, and enacted its laws. Having achieved this brilliant success, it reached out to other Swiss States or cantons, to do for them as at Geneva. It crossed the sea, and took a firm hold upon Scotland, and so fastened itself upon her sturdy minds that it held them with the grasp of a giant, from which thralldom the Scottish mind has not yet been freed. In England, Calvinism asserted itself, and demanded the highest place, priding itself upon being recognized as the established doctrine regarding human salvation. Intrenched in this fortified fastness for many years, it was impossible to advance any other claims. From England Calvinism crossed the Atlantic, and intrenched itself in the sterile soil and among the rugged rocks of New England, and refused to admit the preaching of, and belief in, the doctrine of Arminianism, until that unique pioneer of New England Methodism preached a salvation free to the world of men in Boston Common, while standing upon a borrowed table. Look the facts over, and see if it is not true that Episcopacy, Independency, Congregationalism, and Presbyterianism were all the professors of and in the possession of the hard dogmas of Calvinism. East and West, in the Old World and in the New, there was

only a slight foothold for the warmer, richer, and more soul-encouraging doctrines of Arminianism.

In the world are three great doctrinal systems regarding human salvation, known by distinctive titles; namely, Calvinism, Arminianism, and Universalism. The kernel of each may be stated in a few words.

Calvinism, among other things, says that God in Jesus Christ made provision for the salvation of those in the human race who were predestinated and foreordained from all eternity to be saved in heaven, and the remainder are predestinated and foreordained from all eternity to eternal damnation for the glory of God.

Arminianism teaches that God in Jesus Christ made provision fully for the salvation of all those who, by repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, accept the terms, and all who do thus accept are eternally saved. All who rebel against God, and refuse to accept of Jesus on the terms of proffered mercy, sink under Divine wrath, and are eternally lost.

Universalism teaches that God in Christ Jesus has made such an abundant and merciful provision for human salvation that everybody, irrespective of individual moral character, and without repentance and faith in a Savior, shall be saved in heaven. In this doctrine there is no provision for the punishment of sin hereafter. All punishment of sin is in this life. Universalism has been driven to such

straits as strangely to equivocate in her statements as to how much punishment may be given or required in this life, and how much may be given in a possible state of *post-mortem* purgation. There seems to be no uniform solid ground upon which all believers in the doctrines of Universalism may stand.

According to Calvinism, there is in man a necessitated will, which can act only in certain ways. The will must act, but it is necessitated to act in a certain way. Out of that groove it can not move.

According to Arminianism, there is a perfect freedom of will regarding man's moral condition and powers. Man must make his own choice of salvation, or choose to reject. He may will freely to use the means provided for his salvation, or he may as freely reject. In either case he must abide by the results of his free choice.

According to Universalism, there is no will in salvation. Man is in a condition of salvation without his choice. He is in the stream, and can not do otherwise than go with it into heaven.

A MORE PARTICULAR STATEMENT OF ARMINIANISM.

What is Arminianism? In the fewest words, it is the doctrine that God, by the sacrificial offering of his only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ, has made an abundant provision for the salvation of all human souls who come unto him in the prescribed manner. This provision is universal. Not a soul

is left out of the promise. Every soul that wills to enter life eternal, by using the means designated may enter into life eternal, and not die. All souls who go down to hell, go, not because God has foreordained them to go down to blackness and despair, but because they have willed to reject the offers of mercy.

As to original sin, Arminianism teaches that man, descending from Adam, has become corrupted by Adam's sin, but is not guilty. Adam was both guilty and corrupted. No one will be lost in perdition because of Adam's transgression, but all are in the bondage of corruption because of the sin of the federal head. From the crown of the head to the sole of the foot there is corruption. This involves man's triple nature—body, mind, and spirit. This corruption has so affected the race that no one can return to God by natural means. His virtue is prostrated, his power largely paralyzed, his appetite for purity sadly vitiated, his bent to sin and folly established. But he may will to reach out to proffered redemption by the blood of Jesus Christ, and receive such gracious aid from the Holy Spirit, by the exercise of faith, as to be restored to favor with God and sealed for the kingdom of heaven.

The system of theology that teaches clearly this doctrine is called Arminianism, because that James Arminius advocated it strongly against the Calvinistic doctrine in Holland, while his followers advocated it in the Synod of Dort.

WAS THIS A NEW DOCTRINE WITH ARMINTUS?

No. "Before the time of Augustine [fourth century] the unanimous doctrine of the Church Fathers, so far as scientifically developed at all, was that the Divine decrees as to the fate of the individual man were conditioned upon their faith and obedience, as foreseen in the Divine Mind. Augustine, in his controversy with Pelagius, with a view to enhance the glory of grace, was the first to teach unequivocally that the salvation of the elect depends upon the bare will of God, and that his decree to save those whom he chooses to save was unconditional."

It was left for Gottschalk, in the ninth century, to supply the second part of the doctrine; namely, that those who are not saved unconditionally are foreordained to be damned, or reprobated to be lost. Thus stood the doctrine about 1535, when John Calvin, either at Geneva or at Strasburg, united the foreordination unto eternal life unconditionally of Augustine, and the foreordination of the reprobate to hell unconditionally of Gottschalk, and sent them out as the center of his system of Systematic Theology in the Christian Institutes. The doctrine has since that time received the name of Calvinism.

. There have been some erroneous statements concerning Arminianism, which must have arisen from either a willful perversion of the truth or an

ignorance of it. Dr. Archibald A. Hodge, in Johnson's Encyclopedia, says: "Between these [that is, between Pelagianism and Calvinism] comes the manifold and elastic system of a compromise known as Semi-Pelagianism, and in modern times as Arminianism." There never was a time when Semi-Pelagianism and Arminianism were synonymous terms. They are now, and always have been, quite distinct in their definitions and teaching. To attempt to bring Arminianism into contempt by linking it with Arianism, Socinianism, or with any other kindred notion that is recognized in the Christian world as erroneous, is base in the extreme. It is true that some of these sects have advocated one or two doctrines as held by Arminius; but that does not make them, by any means, Arminians, any more than because a few men are criminals, therefore all men are criminals. Arminianism is a system of its own, wholly distinct from Pelagianism, Semi-Pelagianism, Arianism, Socinianism, and all other isms, and especially from Calvinism.

When James Arminius taught the system now called by his name he was only restoring to the world the doctrine as found in the primitive Church. Calvinism was not the primitive apostolical doctrine or faith. The primitive doctrine universally taught that whosoever willed to come to the Father by the Son could do so, by the way of Jesus Christ, and be eternally saved. Man was made with a will, and was free to act in approach to God, or free to

refuse and go away into despair and darkness and eternal death. James Arminius was the rightful restorer of the doctrine as it flowed from the lips of the impetuous Peter, the beloved John, the sweet-spirited James, the polished Paul, and all the apostles and early Fathers of the Church.

JAMES ARMINIUS.

Who was James Arminius, and how did he come to advocate this doctrine? With this question arises another of some importance: How did the primitive doctrine come to be so long obscured, and such antagonistic notions prevail?

Jacob Hermannson, or, as sometimes called, simply Hermann, was born in the year 1560 A. D., at a town in South Holland called Oudewater. After he began to be a scholar, his name was Latinized into Jacobus Arminius, and in the English the Jacobus became James. His father's name was Hermann Jacobs, and his mother, Angelica, a woman of Dort. His father's occupation was that of a cutler, holding a respectable position in the town. While James was yet an infant his father died, leaving a wife and three children. Jacobus was taken under the care of a former Romish priest by the name of Theodorus *Æ*Emilius. At an early age he was sent to school at Utrecht, to which place *Æ*Emilius had removed. The character of *Æ*Emilius was good, being now a Reformed clergyman, and quite learned, and from him Arminius

received careful training. Theodorus Æmilius was "a man of singular erudition, who stood high among his fellow-townsman for the gravity of his manners and the purity of his life." When the youth was fifteen years of age his foster-father died. At once a friend, Rudolph Snellius, a "profound linguist and most expert mathematician," took him in charge, and in 1575 removed to Marburg for the advantages of that school. This was the year when the Spaniards attacked and sacked Arminius's native town of Oudewater, and cruelly murdered hundreds of innocent people without regard to sex, put its garrison to the sword, and hanged its ministers of religion. Hearing of this sad event, and fearing the worst, Arminius hurried back to find that his mother, brother, and sisters had perished by the hands of the wicked soldiers, and with them several relatives. Overlooking the blackened ruins of his once beautiful home, and saddened by the hard conditions, and feeling that all ties that bound him to this spot had been broken, Arminius walked back to Marburg. Few can realize the sadness of that hour to this youth,—fatherless, motherless, brotherless, sisterless, and homeless, all because of the wicked persecutions of the Church of Rome. The outlook was anything but bright. Only a mysterious, overruling Providence can now provide.

For some unexplained reason he went to Rotterdam, possibly because a few remnants of his Oudewater friends had escaped there, and waited for

something favorable to occur in their native State. Peter Bertius was the pastor of a Reformed Church at that place. He was a large-hearted and philanthropic man, and as a man of God opened his home and received young Arminius into his family. Peter Bertius sent young Arminius, with his son Peter, to the University of Leyden, which had just been founded by William, Prince of Orange. Arminius was fortunate in his teachers at Leyden. Beside Peter Bertius, Sen., was John Taffin, Walloon minister and counselor of the Prince of Orange, Lambert Danæus, a master of varied erudition, "versed at once in philosophical and theological studies," and John Dousa, a poet of no mean character. "Arminius," says Brandt, "soon made such proficiency that he far outstripped his fellow-students. . . . There was scarcely a field of study or department of the arts which he did not bound over with eager and joyous impulse." Here he remained six years. The brilliancy and attainments of the youth attracted the attention of the "Directors of the Merchants of the City of Amsterdam," a body of wealthy and noble-hearted men of strong faith, and concerned in the government of the city. It was agreed that they should furnish all the money necessary to defray his expenses while being educated for the ministry, on conditions which he accepted. On accepting this generous offer, Arminius agreed that "after he had been ordained he would not serve in the Church of any other city

without the permission of the burgomeisters of Amsterdam."

Having accepted the agreement for material aid, in 1582 Arminius went to Geneva to study theology, and fully prepare himself for the work of the Church. Geneva was at that time the center of the Reformed Church. The school stood at the head, and was justly celebrated all over the Christian world. The doctrines clustering around unconditional predestination as taught by John Calvin, were taught and enforced with the intensest rigor, and their form was unchanged by Theodore Beza, who, if possible, was a stronger predestinationist than Calvin. Arminius had a profound admiration for Beza. "With the utmost gravity of manners, this theologian excelled his compeers in persuasiveness of address and in promptitude and perspicuity of utterance, while his learning and attainments in sacred literature were profound and extraordinary. With ears intent Arminius drank in his words; with eager assiduity he hung upon his lips; and with intense admiration he listened to his exposition of the ninth chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans." (Brandt, p. 44.) The progress made by Arminius was great. His mind moved and worked strongly and rapidly. He stood among the first students at Geneva.

While at Geneva, he met with a student from Holland, and of the university of Utrecht, who never Latinized his extravagantly long and hard

name, Uytenbogaert, a man of no mean ability and culture. Their friendship was life-long, and when the time was ripe for it, Uytenbogaert became one of the stanchest advocates of the doctrines promulgated by Arminius. While at Geneva, Arminius began to lecture as well as study. He sharply attacked the philosophy of Aristotle, giving offense to some of the professors by defending Ramus and his system of dialectics in opposition to that of the old Greek philosopher. Great opposition was raised to his remaining at Geneva, and soon he visited Basle, and entered the university and began his studies. So proficient was Arminius in his lecturing and studies, that the faculty of theology offered to confer on him the Doctor's degree gratis. Strange to say, this rising young star among theologians declined the honor, alleging as a reason that he was too young a man to receive such a grave degree.

In 1583, Arminius returned to Geneva, where the storm raised against him had measurably blown over, and he remained three years longer in the study of theology. His mind was permeated with the doctrines of John Calvin, and he did not to the public seem to have any doubts regarding their truth. Yet we have no means of knowing that he at any time strongly advocated them.

In 1586, Arminius was attracted to Padua, Italy, to hear the celebrated professor of philosophy, Zarabella. His mind was not greatly impressed with this master, and he tarried with him

but a short time, and then visited Rome and other places in Italy. In a few months he returned to Geneva to continue his studies. The burgomeisters of Amsterdam, hearing of this journey to Rome, which he undertook without their consent or knowledge, ordered his immediate return to Amsterdam. This they claimed the right to do, because they were furnishing the money for his education, and he was practically their servant, bound to them in body and mind for a lifetime. He was accused by some enemies of having "kissed the Pope's slipper," which meant that he had become a Roman Catholic. He promptly denied this charge, and proved it a false accusation by a traveling companion, and that he was as genuine a reformer as any who remained at Geneva or Amsterdam. On leaving Geneva in the autumn of 1587, he received and bore away a high testimonial from his teachers. In it occurred this sentence: "His mind was in the highest degree qualified for the discharge of duty, should it please God at any time to use his ministry for the promotion of his own work in the Church." (Brandt, p. 53.)

This matter having been settled, he was ordained in the Reformed Church in 1588. His examination took place before the Amsterdam Classis, and by the request of the authorities of the Church, he began his ministry in that city in officiating each week at the "evening services." He delivered a discourse and conducted the prayers. This com-

menced on the 4th of February. He soon attracted such attention by his “style of speaking,” which was “marked by a certain sweet and native grace, tempered with gravity,” that by the action of the Consistory he was placed in charge of the Church in Amsterdam. His church was soon crowded with earnest worshipers. His great soul was on fire for the saving and reformation of Amsterdam. The spirit of a real religious reformation burned within his breast, and he preached righteousness and true holiness with an unusual unction. Arminius was now in the twenty-eighth year of his age. “His discourses,” says Brandt, “were masculine and erudite; everything he uttered breathed the theologian—not raw and commonplace, but superior, acute, cultivated, and replete with solid acquisitions both in human and in sacred literature. This made him such a favorite both with high and low, that in a short time he attracted towards himself the ears and the hearts of all classes alike. In the general admiration of his talents, some styled him ‘a file of truth;’ others, ‘a whetstone of intellect;’ others, ‘a pruning knife for rank growing errors;’ and, indeed, on the subject of religion and sacred study, it seemed as if scarcely anything was known which Arminius did not know.” (Brandt, p. 57.)

Of his visit to Rome Arminius often said that it was of great benefit to him, for he “saw at Rome a mystery of iniquity more foul than he had ever mentioned.” He saw some of the things that had

stirred the heart of Luther, and led to a revolt from the thralldom of the Seven-hilled City.

HOW DID ARMINIUS COME TO ADOPT THE THEORY OPPOSED TO THE LONG-ESTABLISHED DOC- TRINES OF CALVINISM?

Melanchthon in Germany held very mild opinions in regard to predestination. He would not accept or teach the strong doctrine as taught by Augustine or Gottschalk, but taught it in a manner that took away almost the whole of the really objectionable. These notions were known in Germany, and spread through Holland even earlier than the doctrines of Calvin, and found genuine advocates and followers. At Amsterdam, in 1589, a citizen, Richard Koornhert, "published several works in which he attacked the doctrine of predestination which was taught by Beza and the Genevan school." Koornhert's arguments were so fully fortified, and so sharply put, that the Holland theologians were not able to put them aside or show their falsity. The Dutch mind, ordinarily slow to act, now moved quite swiftly, and the doctrines of Koornhert were likely to become universal. To counteract these teachings, and at the same time help to remove some of the more objectionable things in Calvinism, a change or modification of the doctrines of Calvin as taught by Beza, was proposed by certain ministers about Amsterdam.

Some of the ministers of Delft considered this

teaching of Koornhert incendiary and destructive, while others became convinced that Beza was possibly in error to some extent in his presentation of the doctrine of predestination. The Dutch mind was confused as to its theology as most of them received it. While "they agreed, with Beza, that Divine predestination was the antecedent unconditional and immutable decree of God concerning salvation and damnation of each individual," yet they could not agree with Beza that man, considered before he was created, was made the object of unconditional salvation or reprobation. The Delft ministers were not all of them advocates of supralapsarian predestination and reprobation, but held to sublapsarian election; and this blast of Koornhert did not allay the excitement.

The objection of Koornhert to Calvinism was that the "doctrine of absolute decrees represented God as the author of sin, as such decrees made sin necessary and inevitable no less than damnation." The view he published in a book called "*Responsio ad Argumenta Bezæ et Calvinæ*," etc. The book was reckoned heterodoxical and dangerous by the theologians of Delft. It savored too much of free thought and liberal interpretation of God's plans. It seemed to bring man into too familiar and easy intercourse with God. The book must be answered or refuted.

Koornhert was Secretary of State of Holland—a man of learning, who looked into philosophy and

religion with the eyes of a layman. He attacked Romanists, Lutherans, and Calvinists alike, and brought forward an array of antagonisms not easily answered. "He maintained that every religious communion needed reformation, but he said that no one had a right to engage in it without a mission supported by miracles." The Calvinists of Holland, more than Romanists or Lutherans, took umbrage at his treatment of predestination, and demanded its answer. The task of formulating a proper and convincing answer was assigned to Lydius, a professor at Franeker. He besought Arminius to make the answer, to which the Amsterdam scholar and minister consented.

When Arminius commenced the task of examining the book of Koornhert, he went about it like a thoroughly conscientious man, honest in purpose and devoid of desire to deceive or be deceived. Arminius began at the foundation and traversed the entire theme of Koornhert, patiently going over the arguments and counter-arguments, the illustrations and Scriptures, weighing them as to their value and force, until his own mind was filled with doubt as to the truth of Calvinism. How long before he adopted the primitive doctrine and forsook Calvinism can not be determined. His sermons at Amsterdam very soon began to have the flavor of the freedom of the will in matters of salvation, in opposition to the dogma of a necessitated will, and that whoever wills to come to God by Jesus Christ

may come and be made free. For about two years this clear, forcible, primitive preaching continued. It called forth many questions and frequent discussions between himself and the Calvinists. In 1593 his lectures on Romans ix were published. He, in these, quite sharply disputed the teachings of the Genevan school. A party was formed against him ; disputes and contentions ran high. Staid old Amsterdam and her burghers were for once theologically stirred from center to circumference. It was soon discovered that Arminius was a disputant not easily handled. His steel was sharp, his arguments pointed, and his wit keen. It was agreed that between all parties for the time there should be a truce. It was not rigidly maintained.

The mental and spiritual exercises of Arminius in coming out from the mysticism and bondage of doubt under the doctrine of predestination and a necessitated will into the clear light and mental freedom of the doctrine as taught by the early Fathers of the Church, is a story of interest, for it is one of victory. About this time he took for a wife Elizabeth Real, "a woman of elegant manners and a great mind." She was the daughter of one of Amsterdam's greatest judges and senators, and one who had most actively defended his city and country against the unmitigated tyranny and cruelty of the Spaniards. She proved to be "endowed and adorned with hereditary virtues, most exemplary manners, and the love of unaffected

piety"—just such a life as encouraged and stimulated the mind and heart of Arminius to study and teach what his conscience told him was the mind of God.

Finding so much antagonism arising against his teaching of salvation provided for all men and the possibility of all men accepting by faith and receiving pardon of sin, Arminius set a watch over his lips, and continued his studies carefully and persistently. He saw the carnal bondage of many of his Church, and how they needed enlightenment regarding the nature and bondage of sin, together with a freeing of their minds from "vicious and distorted interpretations" of "several passages of Holy Writ on which, not infrequently, as an axiomatic basis, were reared carnal views at variance with genuine Christianity."

Not long after, he made a public exposition of the Epistle to the Romans. When he came to the words, "For we know that the law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under sin," he clearly set forth his views. "His opinion was," says Brandt, "that to interpret this passage as many do, of the man as truly and thoroughly born again through gospel grace, was to do the utmost to invalidate the efficacy of Christian regeneration and the cultivation of genuine piety; inasmuch as the entire exercise of Divine worship, all evangelical obedience, and that new creation which the inspired writers so often and so earnestly inculcate, were thereby shrunk within

such narrow limits as to consist, not in the effect, but simply in the wish. Wherefore, after accurately weighing in his own mind the train of thought in that chapter, and calling to his aid the commentaries of Bucer and others upon it, he publicly taught and maintained that St. Paul in this place does not speak of himself as what he then was, nor yet of a man living under the influence of gospel grace, but personates a man lying under the law, on whom the Mosaic law had performed its functions, and who, in consequence, being by the aid of the Spirit contrite on account of sin, and convinced of the impotence of the law as a means of obviating salvation, was in quest of a deliverer, and was not regenerated indeed, but in the stage next to regeneration."

(Brandt, pp. 66, 67.)

It was not many days after this discourse before the tongue of criticism and slander wagged against Arminius. He was charged with being a Pelagian; for "he ascribed too much goodness to an unregenerate man." Others said he was an heretical teacher, a Socinian; he taught directly opposed to the Belgic Confession; he held contrary to the Palatine Catechism; and he had perverted the Fathers, for he appealed to their teachings to confirm his. The public mind of Amsterdam was soon again seething and boiling at a furious stage. It seemed as if nothing would satisfy some minds but the destruction of Arminius. The calmness of this true reformer was most admirable. The Classical Court

ordered him before them to give “satisfactory explanation of his opinion.” Arminius consented to appear, provided it was in the presence of the rulers of the city, or their delegates, or before his brethren in the ministry, the elders being absent. It was arranged that he should appear before the ministers. After much and earnest prayer, he appeared, and Peter Plaucius became the advocate against him. Many things charged against him, Arminius proved he had never uttered from the pulpit; and others had been entirely perverted to an opposite meaning from what he meant. When they charged him with Pelagianism, he denied it, and “contended that by no legitimate process could they be elicited from his exposition in question, but, on the contrary, were manifestly repugnant to it.” Arminius showed that he had correctly quoted from and interpreted the writings of the ancient divines, or Fathers, and that Bucer and Erasmus, of modern times, agreed with his interpretations of the Epistle to the Romans. Regarding the charge that he taught contrary to the Catechism and Confession, he took ample time to show that he “had taught nothing whatever contrary to these formularies of mutual consent, and that his doctrine on the point in question could be easily reconciled with them.” (Brandt, pp. 69–70.) Rising to a consciousness that he had certain mental and spiritual rights, he declared that “he was in no respect bound to every private interpretation of the Reformed, but was

plainly free, and entitled to expound the heavenly oracles and particular passages of the sacred volume according to the dictates of conscience; and that, in so doing, he would ever be on his guard against advancing aught which tends to tear up the foundation of the Christian faith." (*Ibid.*, p. 70.)

While by the majority Arminius was cleared of all guilt under these charges, still there were individuals who clamored for his arrest and deposition, and sought by every means to detract from his greatness, his innocence, and his usefulness. Chief among these traducers was this same Peter Plaucius. He was not satisfied with traducing the character of the minister in Amsterdam, but at The Hague and elsewhere. M. Lydius and Uytenbogaert went to Amsterdam in the fond hope of settling matters, and restoring harmony, but all to no purpose. At last the matter was brought before the new senators, who invited the retiring senators to sit with them, and they determined to hear the charges of Plaucius and others, and Arminius's answer. The senators, the 11th of February, heard the case. After the charges had been presented and advocated fully, Arminius was permitted to speak in his own behalf. This he did in his own masterly manner. He took up the charges item by item, and showed clearly that what he taught was not against the Catechism or Belgic Confession, but in harmony with them in his interpretation of Romans vii. What seemed to be at variance was

not with the authorized standards, but the interpretations of some divines. He entered a strong plea for freedom of conscience in Scripture interpretation. He said "he had not entertained a doubt that it would be free to him, in the exercise of that liberty, to discuss sacred subjects which belong to all Christians and Christian teachers whatsoever, to expound this or that passage of Scripture according to the dictates of conscience. Further, since the hinge of the existing difference turned mainly on this point, that some thought his opinion of that passage opposed to the received ecclesiastical formularies, and that this was a charge of which he could be easily convicted, he, for his part, held himself in readiness, for the vindication of his name, to enter into a conference with his compeers; but he earnestly entreated that such conference should take place in the presence of the senators themselves, or their delegates; for he anticipated that the issue of this case would be more satisfactory were these influential men to be present, not as witnesses merely, but as moderators and righteous arbiters in respect to all that might be advanced on either side." (Brandt, pp. 83-84.)

As soon as his assailants could get the floor, they demanded that the conference or discussion be held in the presence of the Classis, and not before the senators. But the honorable senators took occasion to order all the ministers to retire, after which they deliberated as to the merits of the charges against

Arminius, the manner in which they were advocated, and the gentle, learned, and logical reply of Arminius. The unanimous decision of the senators was presented by their president:—"That it was the opinion and decree of the honorable senators that the Church Court should allow this whole matter to rest, and permit whatever discussions had arisen out of it up to this time to be consigned to oblivion. A fresh conference upon it did not appear to them to be suitable, or likely to do good. They (the ministers) must henceforth be on their guard, lest any of them should give vent to new doctrines from the pulpit. Should any of them have opinions in which they differed from other divines, and on which they boasted a profounder knowledge, it would be incumbent on them to reserve these to themselves, and to talk them over in a friendly manner with their compeers. Meanwhile, those who think differently, and who can not be convinced of error, must be calmly foreborne with until the points in dispute be decided by the authority of some council."

Having rendered this decision, two of the senators added a "very grave and serious admonition, . . . to cultivate that fraternal harmony and peace by which they were wont to be distinguished." (Brandt, p. 85.)

Thus this great thinker, eminent scholar, and devout Christian, Arminius, was again vindicated.

CHAPTER II.

ARMINIUS AS PROFESSOR AT LEYDEN.

Pestilence in Holland—Death of Junius, a Professor of Divinity at Leyden—James Arminius proposed for the Vacancy—The Opposition of Gomarus—His Address to the Curators—They determined to have Arminius—Not inclined to accept—The Objections at Amsterdam overcome—Released—Elected—Examined for the Doctorate—Success—His Oration on the Occasion—His Orations on taking his Chair—Effect upon the Students—Enemies—Said that Predestination made God the Author of Sin—Made Rector Magnific—Hominius—Followers of Arminius accused of his Crimes—Excitement spread to Other Ecclesiastical Bodies—Address on Righteousness and Divine Providence—Two Significant Facts: 1st. People misquoted and perverted his Meaning; 2d. He never failed to meet any Disputant on the Questions of Doctrine—Question of a National Synod—Arminius's Oration—Why a National Synod had not been convened—A Synod ordered by the States General—Controversy as to Revision—A Synod of South Holland at Goreum—Call made upon the Leyden Professors as to the Belgic Confession and Palatinate Catechism—Opportunity for Arminius to speak of the Confession—Petition for a Preliminary Synod at The Hague—Arminius's Letter to Hypolitus—Apology—Declaration of Sentiments at The Hague—The Misfortune of his Death—His Motto—Grotius's Remark concerning Arminius.

A PESTILENCE raged in Holland, and the chair of Divinity in the University of Leyden was made vacant by the death of Francis Junius in 1602.

The curators of the university were favorably impressed with James Arminius, from what they had learned of his ability, and selected him as their candidate for the successor. When the chair was tendered to Arminius he felt himself under obligations to the Church at Amsterdam, because of their having furnished the money for his education, and reported the case to them. The burghers of Amsterdam were unwilling to release him from his pulpit; but Uytenbogaert, who at this time was minister at The Hague and chaplain to Maurice, Prince of Orange, succeeded in obtaining his release from his contract with the men of Amsterdam.

There were many of the Calvinistic ministers who were opposed to Arminius becoming professor of Divinity at Leyden, because of his well-known anti-Calvinistic notions. Among these was Professor Gomarus, one of the Divinity professors at Leyden, who to the end of his life continued to antagonize Arminius. Gomarus was a man of culture and influence, but was the embodiment of strong prejudices. He had been appointed by the curators of the Leyden Academy to deliver the funeral oration in honor of Junius. When the curators were in session, Gomarus went into their presence to report his discharge of the duty imposed upon him and present them with a copy of his oration. He took occasion to speak against James Arminius, who he had heard was their candidate for a successor of Junius. He gave them to

understand that to himself Arminius was very offensive; that Junius, while living, "had no favorable opinion of Arminius." In Amsterdam "he had it in his power to infect one Church only, but here he could infect many, not only in this but in other lands." He accused Arminius of self-seeking, "but no faith was to be attached to his words." The effect of this speech was rather to lead some to sympathy with Arminius; for when Gomarus was asked if he knew Arminius, he was compelled to say "he only saluted him once, as he despaired him at a little distance." When questioned as to how he knew about the peculiar teachings of Arminius, he said he had it "from ministers most worthy of credit." When pressed for the names of those ministers he could only name Plaueius.

These curators put but little confidence in the address of Gomarus, or reference to Plaueius, but set about finding out for themselves as to their accusations. They called into their council John Van Olden Barneveldt, who advised them to consult Uytenbogaert. After a careful and searching examination, they found James Arminius an innocent man, and all they could desire as the successor of Junius.

When the proposition of the curators was presented to Arminius, he promptly dissented from their choice. He questioned his own ability, the willingness of the senators of Amsterdam to release him, and the consent of his enemies to allow him

to take the honorable chair. Some great names were arrayed against Arminius, while as equally famous men stood for his election. There were sharp discussions on both sides. Gomarus led the party against Arminius, while Uytenbogaert led the party for him. The sermons, addresses, letters, and conversations of Arminius were read, criticised, discussed, condemned, and praised. The curators patiently heard all that was said. Not once was Arminius before them. He was informed of all the proceedings; he was not flustered, angered, or discouraged, but left all in the hands of Providence, knowing that he had not done or said anything worthy of such condemnation. Calmly he waited the issue. His dear friend, Uytenbogaert, wrote him these consoling words: "I would have you be of good cheer. . . . The Lord God will provide, and grant that success which he knows will be most conducive to his own glory and the edification of the Church, yea, more, and to the salvation of me and mine. On him I cast all my care. He will bring forth my righteousness as the light, and my judgment as the noonday." (Brandt, 162.)

Every step of the way to the professorship at Leyden, Arminius was stopped by objections, questions of doctrine, suspicions, attacks of enemies,—led mostly by Gomarus. At last all seemed cleared away. The curators said "that the suspicions stirred against Arminius had not been substantiated, nor was there just cause why any one should

judge unfavorably respecting him; for in the exercise of liberty granted him of prophesying [of discussing sacred things] in the Church, he had taught nothing that was inimical to the Christian religion." (Brandt, pp. 179, 180.)

Having been called and elected to the professorship, the next step was to be made a doctor, and invested with the office. On the 19th of June, he was examined by Gomarus before Grotius and Merula. All expressed themselves as fully satisfied with the examination. On the 10th of July, Arminius held a disputation on the subject "Concerning the Nature of God." His opponents were Peter Bertius, Hominius, Crucius, and Grevinchovius. He held his place against them in a manner to gain "universal applause." The next day, Gomarus invested Arminius with the honor of the well-earned Doctor's degree, with the usual formalities. At the same time Arminius delivered his great oration "Concerning the Priestly Office of Christ." The testimonial, or diploma, given by the academy to Arminius, is full of flattery of its kind. It is recorded that Arminius was the first to receive the Doctor's degree at Leyden.

On taking his chair, he found that the students of the university of Leyden had been giving more attention to the intricate controversies and knotty questions of the schoolmen than to the studies of the Scripture and theology. The spirit in which he entered upon his work is expressed by

himself in a letter of September 22, 1603. "I will, therefore, with the help of the good God, address myself to this province, and look for success by his abundant blessing. He knows from what motive I have undertaken this office, what is my aim, what object I have in view in discharging the duties of it. He discerns and approves, I know. It is not the empty honor of this world—mere smoke and bubble—nor the desire of amassing wealth (which indeed were in vain, let me strive to the utmost), that has impelled me hither; but my one wish is to do public service in the gospel of Christ, and to exhibit that gospel as powerfully and plainly as possible before those who are destined, in their time, to propagate it to others." (Brandt, pp. 187-188.)

Such a spirit led him to give three "elegant and polished orations" on these topics, "Of the Object of Sacred Theology," "Of the Author and End of Theology," and "Certitude." "By this method," writes Brandt, "he strove to instill into the minds of the students a love for that divine and most dignified of all the sciences; and at his very entrance into his office he judged with Socrates, the wisest of the Gentiles, that the principal part of his responsibility stood fulfilled could he only succeed in inflaming his disciples with an ardent desire of learning."

His first effort was to change the condition of things he found at Leyden, and he began by lec-

tures on the Bible as "the foundation of all truth." During this time he brought out in his lectures to the students his full and free method of Scripture interpretation, which charmed his hearers, and made the curators rejoice in this acquisition of so great and noble a teacher in place of Junius, who had been removed by the hand of death.

In the meantime, the enemies of Arminius were suspicious, and watching for an opportunity to assail his character and destroy his reputation. An occasion presented itself in a little time. Two students of theology invited him to "honor with his presence their theses, or positions, which they had drawn up to be subjected to public examination." One was on *Justification*, the other on *Original Sin*. Arminius knew that other professors had been present under such circumstances, when the doctrine of the theses was not according to their mind. Now, since there were some things in these he did not indorse, his enemies made it an occasion of great fault-finding. While no open rupture followed, Gomarus sought, by mutterings, to poison the minds of students, curators, and the public, and set them against him. The next year Arminius began a course of lectures on the Old Testament, with an occasional "exposition of certain portions of the New." This so greatly displeased Gomarus that, meeting Arminius, he broke out in "a burst of passion," saying: "You have invaded my professorship!" To this, Arminius made the defense that

the curators had given him a certificate "to select themes for prelection at any time, not only from the Old Testament, but also from the New, provided he did not encroach upon the particular subject in which Gomarus might be engaged." While he had not in fact trespassed upon the rights of Gomarus, the charge was made, and served as an occasion for other charges and complaints.

There were many injurious reports circulated by his enemies, which had a tendency to injure his reputation with the Government and among the Churches. During the years 1605–1608 there was a constant besieging of Arminius on the question of predestination. At first he was led to answer in moderate terms, though holding the views that later were more fully and sharply advocated. He did not desire to stir up unnecessary antagonism to himself, or lead men to the advocacy of what he believed to be wrong. Gomarus, as the leader, and Helmichius, John Kuchlinas his uncle, Lansbergius, and others, were constantly throwing out hints as to Arminius's heterodoxy, and made charges against his integrity as a Christian man, and in many ways sought to annoy him, and lead to a statement of his doctrines, so that, as ardent believers in unconditional predestination, they might have something against him as a believer in the freedom of the will, and that Jesus Christ died to make salvation possible for all men. They often said, Arminius is to be ranked with the Pelagians,

though the assertion was as often refuted. It is probable that he rasped their feelings when he said of the predestinationism of Calvin, Beza, and Gomarus, that it "*made God the author of sin.*" "His adversaries left no means untried by which to burn some brand of contumely into his rising reputation." A rumor was set afloat by some means, which went out through all Holland, that "the professors of sacred literature differed seriously among themselves." The matter became one of great discussion. Brandt says that this "was everywhere in the mouths of carders, furriers, weavers, and other artisans of that class." A novel thing occurred in this wild and ignorant dispute. Many of them erroneously attributed the opinions of Arminius to Gomarus, and the dogmas of Gomarus to Arminius. There is no doubt that good finally ultimated from this great discussion.

Early in 1605 the curators of the Leyden University presented Arminius with the fasces of the incorporation, and gave him the title of "Rector Magnific." This new honor evidenced how he stood with them, and was a sure indication that these laymen had all confidence in his learning, integrity, and skill in conducting the affairs of their rising school. But this only led his enemies to a bitterer warfare. If he chanced to "advance certain arguments which were also employed by popish writers themselves, by Lutherans, and others besides the Reformed, the clamor was forthwith raised by ig-

norant persons that he had gone over to the enemy's camp." (Brandt, p. 209.)

About the university and in Leyden matters were all astir, and temper was at fever-heat. It seemed as if nearly all of accusation was against Arminius. The basest construction was placed on "his best words and deeds." It was charged that he circulated his own written books among his students, following in that respect Calvin, Junius, and others. This act was called a crime. He was charged with teaching against unconditional predestination. One Festus Hominius was bold to utter severe charges against Arminius behind his back which he dared not repeat before his face.

His followers and admirers came in for a large share of accusation "of the same crimes which were imputed to himself; the discourses and arguments by which they sought to establish the doctrines of the Christian faith being subjected to misinterpretation." If a student became in any way a special admirer of Arminius, or seemed to be a favorite with him, he was instantly marked, and some new insult was heaped upon Arminius.

This feverish excitement soon spread to some ecclesiastical bodies, and charges were made against various persons who in any sense favored Arminius and his doctrines. It did not require a very acute observer of the events of history to prognosticate that the time would come when an open rupture on doctrine would occur, which might involve the

States of Holland as well as the Church of the Reformed, and might be accompanied by instances of bloodshed and martyrdom. Intolerance on the part of the Reformed might develop what followed the intolerance of the Papal Church.

Arminius, on the 4th of May, 1605, demonstrated his belief in Divine Providence in a public disputation "Concerning the Righteousness and Efficacy of Divine Providence Respecting Evil." His thesis was one of his most polished and elaborately prepared. "He very learnedly," says Brandt, "explained in what manner it had to do, not only with the beginning, but also with the progress and with the end of sin. Making allusion, in another place, to the circumstance and that controversy, he observes: 'There are two stumbling-blocks against which I am solicitously on my guard—not to make God the author of sin, and not to do away with the freedom inherent in the human will; which two things, if any one knows to avoid, there is no action he shall imagine which I will not most cheerfully allow to be ascribed to the providence of God, if due regard be only had to the Divine excellence.'" (Brandt, p. 221.)

The student of Arminianism will not fail to observe two most significant facts. When Arminius gave utterance to any doctrine, however carefully worded, he was at once misquoted, his statements perverted to other meanings than such as he intended, and constructions placed upon his doctrines

foreign to their original intent. When he appealed to his written statements—for he was very scrupulous to preserve his thoughts carefully written out, in either Latin or his native tongue—and compared his doctrines with that of the early Church, he silenced the cavilers, and often they were forced to admit the truth of his teachings as being in harmony with the doctrines of the Fathers and the Scriptures. It mattered not whether he was called before the Classis, the curators, the National Synod, the faculty of the university, in a private company, or by a single person, Arminius was always ready, armed and equipped for a disputation, and always clearly gave a reason for his faith and doctrine, backing them up with many Scriptures, with reference to the early Fathers and to some of the modern divines, who held to views similar to his own.

It will also be observed that he never hesitated to appear, when appeal was made, to meet the best disputants on these great questions; nor did he swerve from the same faith, having once become fully persuaded of its truth. He was always the advocate of salvation provided for all men, freedom of the will to choose or reject God's offers of mercy, and that, under an unconditional election, God was the author of sin. When stirred to his soul's depths by a consideration of the dangers resulting from teaching the doctrine of unconditional predestination, he spoke to the point, and men knew precisely what he meant.

THE QUESTION OF A NATIONAL SYNOD.

Arminius saw the strife and disputation in his loved Netherlands on those subjects which were purely of a theological character, and he also knew that they might be carried so far as to assume a political cast. Having brought his lectures on Jonah to a close, and opened the year 1606 with a course on Malachi, on the eighth day of February he resigned his rectorship of the School of Theology. A goodly company were assembled, and he gave his excellent oration on "Religious Dissension." The oration was not the spontaneous offering of the hour, but something he had carefully prepared after fully thinking out all its points, and noting its bearings upon the discussions of the day.

In this oration he unfolded the subject of dissension in its "nature and effects, causes and remedies, with such freedom of speech as the weight of the subject itself and the agitated circumstances of the Church seemed to require. In particular, as the remedy commonly considered to be the most efficacious for allaying theological dissensions, was a convention of the parties at variance (which the Greeks call a Synod, the Latins a Council), he unfolded on that same occasion, fully and piously, the principle on which a Council of the kind referred to ought to be constituted, so as to warrant the just and rational expectation that it will issue in good works of the most salutary character." (Brandt, p. 246.)

There had been a demand made some years before this for a National Synod. As early as 1597 discussions and controversies had arisen in such places as Gonda, Hoorn, and Medenblick, "not only respecting Divine predestination, but also concerning the authority of the Belgic Confession and Palatine Catechism, and the right and orthodox interpretation of certain phrases." The demand was so great that finally some of the States of Holland led in granting liberty to their pastors to hold such a Synod. It was expressly stated "that the Belgic Confession of Faith should be revised, and that it should be carefully considered in what way, most fitly, according to the Word of God, the true doctrine and concord of the Reformed Church of the Netherlands might be vindicated, preserved, and promoted, and the dissensions that had arisen be allayed." (*Ibid.*, 247.)

But the States General had not considered it necessary to convene a National Synod, even though many of the States had asked for it. When Arminius began to be celebrated, and his words moved other Holland professors and pastors who differed from him in doctrine, leave was given, March 15, 1606, by the States General, to the assembling of a National Synod. The States General of the Netherlands marked out for it the same terms and duties as eight years previously had been designated. The Synod was to make "revision of the Confession [Belgic] and Catechism of said Churches [Re-

formed], and of the Ecclesiastical Constitution heretofore in use among them." (Brandt, p. 249.)

Immediately there sprung up much discussion over the word "revision." One party claimed that it was used in a "forensic" sense, and meant that "the entire doctrine comprehended in the summaries was called in question; that by this edict injury was done to these sacred canons of the Reformed faith, which were formerly received with so great applause." The Reformed pastors and professors, heartily holding to "unconditional predestination" and the accompanying doctrines, were wholly opposed to the word "revision," while Arminius, Uytenbogaert, and men of like faith, held to the word "revision." Some said it was only to be a "re-examination" of the Confession.

Controversy and discussion waxed warm. The sturdy Dutch were moved. A Synod of South Holland was held in August, 1606, at Gorcum, known in local history as the Gorcum Synod. A committee of four men were appointed to proceed to Leyden and interview the professors of theology, and ask them "to peruse and examine with all diligence the Confession and Catechism hitherto in use in these realms." These professors were requested "that if, in these writings of the Confession and the Catechism, any one had observed aught worthy of remark, he should signify the same, and set it forth in good and solid reasons and arguments as speedily as practicable, and that, if possible,

before the next meeting of the Classis." (*Ibid.*, 256.)

The Synod also, by letter, apprised other Synods in the various States of the Netherlands of what they had done. When the committee reached Leyden they first called on Gomarus and made known their errand. He hesitated, and declined to make answer unless the dean (Arminius) would call the theological faculty together. Trelocatius answered much the same way. The committee said that the Synod desired their answers as individuals—professors—and not as a faculty. When Arminius was waited upon, he at once acquiesced in the request of the Gorcum Synod. He thought the proper way was for each professor to give the result of his independent examination of the Confession and Catechism, and not give the result as a faculty. Gomarus and Trelocatius finally consented to follow the course of Arminius.

The way seemed providentially opened for the great mind and heart of Arminius to have full play in an interpretation of the Confession as harmonized with Scripture. He made a most careful review of the Belgic Confession, and the Palatinate Catechism, and the polity of the Reformed Church in Holland. He counseled with his friends of like views. He confided much in the judgment of John Halsberg, a faithful minister of the Church at Amsterdam. Unfortunately, this noble friend was soon stricken down by death, and Arminius mourned

him as a brother beloved. It seemed all-important that at this time Arminius should remain in good health, so as to prosecute his studies and prepare his papers for the coming Synod.

It was marvelous how many arose to malign this great scholar and eminent Christian. He who saw more clearly the light of God's truth than the majority of thinkers, and sought to break the fetters fastened upon so many minds, was hated, scorned, scoffed, persecuted everywhere. But he held on, true to God and his Scripture, with a heart abounding in love for his fellow-men bound in chains of sin.

The deputies of South and North Holland petitioned the States General for a preliminary Synod, to be held at The Hague, to arrange the details and work of the National Synod. After due deliberation the request was granted, and the 22d of May, 1608, fixed as the date of its sitting. Much discussion was carried forward in almost every part of the two Hollands. Aspersions were made against Arminius. He often met and refuted them in his accustomed manner. Forbearance at last ceased to be a virtue, and early in 1608 he began a defense, in vindication of himself and his teachings, in three ways—

1. By a request and a subsequent letter, addressed to Hippolytus à Collibus, the ambassador to the States of the United Provinces of the illustrious Prince Palatine, Frederick the Fourth.

Following this, he was admitted, on invitation of the ambassador, to his court at The Hague. Hippolytus received the Leyden professor courteously, and heard a candid and accurate explanation of his opinions "concerning the Divinity of the Son of God, Providence and Divine predestination, Grace and Free-will, and also on the subject of Justification." This learned and candid nobleman grasped the arguments of Arminius, and accepted them as the true expression of the mind of God regarding these important doctrines. At the solicitation of Hippolytus, Arminius drew up (April 5, 1608) that "most erudite and elaborate epistle," which is now among the published works of Arminius. It is "a succinct defense of his doctrine, as well as of his life." (Brandt, p. 302.)

2. By a reply "which is esteemed as an apology to thirty-one defamatory articles falsely ascribed to him and Adrian Borrius."

3. By the Declaration of Sentiments, delivered on the 30th of October, 1608, before the representatives of the States in full assembly at The Hague (which will be noticed in a succeeding chapter). In this Declaration of Sentiments Arminius presented in a most successful manner the subjects of predestination, Divine providence, the freedom of the will, the grace of God, the Divinity of the Son of God, and the justification of men before God. He then followed each case with an argument of his own in opposition, estab-

lishing his propositions by reference to the Scriptures, the teachings of the Fathers, and to the history of the early Church.

It is a great misfortune, as it seems, so soon after the conclusion of his defense of the position which he had taken regarding Calvinism, that, at the age of forty-nine years, he should have ceased to work and live. His death occurred on the 19th of October, 1609.

James Arminius was distinguished among men for "the virtue and amiability of his private, domestic, and social character among Christians; for his charity toward those who differed from him in opinion; among preachers for his zeal, eloquence, and success; and among divines for his acute yet large and comprehensive views of theology, his skill in argument, and candor and courtesy in controversy." He was a man of great learning; his influence in the religious world had really but just begun, and had another decade of years been added to his life, there is no telling what he might have accomplished. His death left the controversy between the Calvinists and his own party in such a condition that some one must take it up and carry it forward. His motto was "*Bona conscientia paradisus*—A good conscience is a paradise." The great Hugo Grotius said of him: "Condemned by others, he condemned none."

CHAPTER III.

ARMINIAN LEADERS.

Leaders in Arminianism—Simon Episcopius, a Great Scholar and Theologian—Education—Adopted by the Senate of Amsterdam—At the University of Leyden—His Theses and Disputations—When he adopted Arminianism—A Student of Gomarus and Arminius—Arminius made the Greater Impression—Episcopius the Defender of Arminianism—Uytenbogaert—Fine Personal Appearance—Pastor at Utrecht—Formerly a Student with Arminius at Geneva—Uytenbogaert Anxious for Toleration—Presided at Remonstrant Synod at Wallevick—Chaplain to an Embassy to Paris—At Antwerp—Goods confiscated and he banished—Fled to Rouen—Secret Return to Rotterdam—Sentence revoked—Obtained a Part of his Goods—Prohibited from preaching—Strictly watched—Died—Hugo Grotius—Born—At Leyden—Wrote a Poem—At Paris—Eminently a Litterateur—Pensioner of Rotterdam—In England—Utopian Scheme with Casaubon—Embraced Arminianism—Wrote Much for it—A Strong Support—Arrested and a Prisoner at Loewenstein—Novel Escape—In France—Died at Roostock—Buried at Delft—Barneveldt, a Layman—Life Admirably written by Motley—Conflict—Remonstrants—Counter-remonstrants—Five Points of Calvinism—Five Arminian Articles—The Things they controverted—The Vote against Arminianism—The Victory over Arminianism was not of Advantage to Calvinism—Statement of Mosheim.

THE death of James Arminius in 1609 did not stop the great controversy between Calvinism and what we will from this time call Arminianism.

While the Calvinists in Holland outnumbered the Arminians several times, and theirs was the popular belief because the Government sided with it, there were many strong, cultured, and conscientious men, scholars of the upper class, who embraced Arminianism as the only true explanation of the Divine government in the matter of original sin, freedom of the will, and the salvation of men. The controversy was carried forward, some of the time, under the auspices of the State, and at others in a more private manner, and in the Churches. At times there was the spirit of kindness in the discussions, but generally the opposite feeling prevailed. This controversy continued until the whole of Holland was in a blaze of excitement.

SIMON EPISCOPIUS.

The mantle of the great Arminius fell upon Simon Episcopius (1583–1644), a worthy successor of so great a man. Episcopius was called at once to become the professor of Theology in Leyden University, in the place vacated by the death of Arminius. Another great Arminian writer was James Uytenbogaert (1557–1644), preacher at The Hague for many years, and “for some time chaplain of Prince Maurice.” These two men became the principal leaders in the controversy, and manfully maintained the honor and dignity of Arminianism against all adversaries. There were two other notable advocates of Arminianism—one a

layman, the other a clergyman. The one was John Van Olden Barneveldt (1549–1619), advocate-general of Holland and Friesland, a statesman of high standing, and one of the foremost men of the Dutch Republic. He was a staunch friend of Arminius, and a firm believer in the doctrine; and while others were going away to the extreme of Calvinism, he returned from his former belief in Calvinism to a belief in the opposite. Hugo Grotius (1583–1645), “the most comprehensive scholar of his age, equally distinguished as statesman, jurist, theologian, and exegete, sympathized with the Arminians.” These two noble men gave all their weight of influence to the side of the Arminians, and by words and actions sought to advance peace and toleration.

Simon Episcopius, whose real name was Bisschop, was born at Amsterdam, of honorable Christian parents of the Reformed belief. Very early in life this youth gave decisive proofs of a vigorous understanding and capacious memory, accompanied with an ardent desire to obtain information. The time of his birth was filled with danger to all of the Reformed faith in Holland; for the persecutions carried on by the Spanish Alva were cruel and unmixed with the least grain of mercy. He was destined by his parents for one of the learned professions, but, by request of Burgomeister Benning, he was finally devoted “to the pursuit of literature.” At the public Latin school, under the rectorship of

Beckemanus, he made "rapid progress in the acquisition of the Greek and Latin languages." His rapid advancement and brilliant mind brought him to the attention of the Senate of Amsterdam as a specially bright man, and one worthy of their consideration. They had found before this, in adopting Arminius, that they had adopted a man who reflected great glory upon their State, and so they were ready and willing to look for others of the same general character. The Senate adopted him as one of their *alumni*, or *Voesterlings*, and furnished him the means to complete his education. Whether there was an agreement that he should return, at the completion of his education, and engage as their minister, or not, is not known. He was placed in the University of Leyden, where he completed his course, and was made Master of Arts February 27, 1606. Now his theological studies commenced, and were chiefly prosecuted under the direction of James Arminius.

In his theses and disputations Episcopius exhibited great skill and learning. His proficiency soon led the curators and professors to recognize him as "in every way worthy to enter the ministry." This information having been communicated to those of Amsterdam, the Senate and magistrates of that city desired to hear him for themselves, and appointed the 11th of June, 1607, as the time, and the New South Church as the place, for his sermon. A splendid Dutch audience assembled to hear and

judge for themselves as to this remarkable rising man. It was a season of great test to himself; for, if he should fail in his undertaking to preach a sermon that should produce a marked effect upon their minds and thus establish his reputation, his future history would be greatly changed. The audience was not disappointed. He impressed them as a master workman, clear in his illustration, strong in his logic, elegant in his rhetoric. Episcopius was very soon called "the Dutch Cicero." His appointment soon came as court preacher or chaplain to Prince Maurice, and also preacher at The Hague. At this time he came into intimate relations with the great statesman, John of Barneveldt, an eminent Arminian.

As to the time when Episcopius changed his views from Calvinism to Arminianism, we are wholly unable to discover. It is probable that the seeds of a change were early planted in his mind, and that the real change was a thing gradual in itself. When he became a student in theology he had for two of his professors, Gomarus, the ardent Calvinist, and James Arminius, the equally ardent antagonist of the doctrines of predestination. Arminius seems to have given the stronger impression to the young mind, and left him wholly freed from the bondage of Calvinism. During the latter part of his stay at Leyden the discussions between Arminius and Gomarus commenced. At first they were very private between themselves, but soon began to be open and

public. Episcopius's taste for discussion naturally led him to take a great interest in these discussions. These disputations concerning predestination were destined thoroughly to agitate all the Netherlands, and finally to reach to regions far away. After the death of Arminius it became necessary for Episcopius to defend the memory of his great friend and teacher—a task which he performed in the most admirable manner.

UYTENBOGAERT.

Uyttenbogaert was an able defender of Arminianism, standing by the side of Simon Episcopius, and making himself, by his logic and great attainments, sensibly felt in these theological discussions. He became a leader of the Remonstrants, “was an independent and earnest, and yet a moderate and considerate man, everywhere maintaining a firm and upright character, and incessantly engaged in making peace among the parties of Protestantism. As a preacher he stood in the front ranks of the Remonstrants, for his logic, rhetoric, and persuasive eloquence. He was a native of Utrecht, born 1557. His theological studies were conducted at Geneva, under Beza. On completing his course of study he became pastor of a Church in Utrecht in 1584, but was dismissed, because of his liberal views regarding predestination and the other doctrines of Calvinism, in 1589. The succeeding year he was called to The Hague, and

became court chaplain to William, and tutor to his son. Here his reputation became greater than ever as a preacher and a scholar."

Uytenbogaert was a man of fine personal appearance, and his movements combined both perfect grace and dignity. People with whom he came in contact were charmed by his wise words and superior manners. In his address to the States he set before them "the rights and duties they were bound to observe." He showed the inadmissibility of compulsory support of a symbol, demonstrated that the clergy itself had occasioned the troubles in the Church, and that the object of the Church was to enforce the principles of the independence of the spiritual powers. He demanded that "the State should examine the questions in dispute themselves, and bring them to a conclusion; and that, in the event of a Synod being called, no conclusion should be reached before the opposing party should have an opportunity to be heard; and finally, that if fraternity between factions could not be obtained, mutual tolerance should at least be insured."

The influence of Uytenbogaert was great, inasmuch that many who halted about accepting Arminianism and breaking away from Calvinism, were moved to take a decided stand for one or the other. His enemies saw and felt his rising powers as a logician and ardent advocacy of the primitive doctrine, and greatly feared his influence in the coun-

cils of the State. In order to prevent his influence from reaching to the Netherlands, and break his power over them if it did reach them, they invoked the aid of the State. When this was brought to bear against him, it was not possible even then for his enemies to close his mouth, or prevent his work for his favorite doctrine.

Uytenbogaert was anxious, not so much to root out Calvinism, as to gain the principle of toleration, so that Arminianism might have legal right to existence. He was willing that Calvinism should live and be, but not on the death of Arminianism. He seemed to be willing to allow the various opinions regarding Christian doctrines to live and be advocated as completely as their adherents might desire; but he insisted that there should be such a perfect degree of toleration that all the different doctrines should have an equal right to public discussion, and that the occupants of the pulpits of the various sects should be free to preach whatever doctrine they believed to be true. Nowhere do we find that Uytenbogaert desired to prevent even the Roman Catholics from having the fullest opportunity to present their doctrines, and worship according to their custom. His one watchword was "Toleration." He argued this when chaplain to an embassy to Paris; and when, in 1612, he, with Episcopius, held a colloquy with the most rigid Calvinists at The Hague, "in the vain hope of securing peace," legal proceedings were entered against

him because of his interpretation of the Five Points of the Remonstrants. His presiding at a Remonstrant Synod at Wallevick greatly intensified the hostility of his enemies. The storm of persecution broke upon him more fiercely than ever, and he removed to Antwerp in 1622, when the sentence of confiscation of property and banishment was pronounced against him. It became necessary for him to go to Rouen, in France, in the vain hope of finding a safe retreat and rest from the enemies who sought to compass his death. He returned secretly to Rotterdam in 1626, and was secreted by friends. Here he secured counsel, who sought to obtain from the court a revocation of the sentence promulgated against him and his friends. He succeeded, in 1629, in obtaining the larger part of his goods, which had been confiscated some years before. In 1631 another act was granted, permitting him to reside at The Hague, and "be present during public worship." He was permitted also to preach a few times; but it is supposed, because of the fear still entertained of his wonderful pulpit eloquence, he was prohibited from continuing his teaching. A strict watch was kept over him, lest he should break over bounds and lead the Arminian party to success. The Calvinistic party was in the ascendency, had absolute control of the Government, and were nearly as intolerant as the Romanists had been a few years before. The noble and scholarly Utenbogaert died September 4, 1644, a man of God.

and intensely loved by his followers. His name, though hard to pronounce, has been almost a talisman and a tower of strength to the Arminians of Holland.

HUGO GROTIUS.

Two other great names, Hugo Grotius and John Van Olden Barneveldt, are to be united with Episcopius and Uytenbogaert as defenders and leaders in the great Arminian movement—one of the greatest of the close of the sixteenth and early part of the seventeenth centuries.

Hugo Grotius was a native of Delft, born April 10, 1583. So rapid was his progress in learning that, when eleven years old, he entered the University of Leyden, and distinguished himself in mathematics, law, and theology. He was able, when fourteen years of age, to maintain two theses in philosophy with great skill, and also write a poem in Latin in honor of King Henry IV, of France. This poem was so highly esteemed, that when the next year he visited Paris with the Dutch embassy, he received an introduction to the king, who gave to Grotius a brilliant reception. Grotius commenced the practice of law, but devoted a large portion of his time to the subject of literature. In this line of work he was acute, quick, possessed of an excellent judgment, and was industrious. Each year he published a new book, or an edition of some important work already published to the world by a scholar. When appointed a pensioner

of Rotterdam he refused the office unless it was secured to him for life, which was granted. In the States General, a legislative assemblage, he met Barneveldt, with whom his associations were of the pleasantest character, and continued unabated until the cruel death of Barneveldt. On visiting England he became associated with Casaubon, a prominent Romanist, with whom he thought and planned a union of the Romanists and Protestants. To this project he gave large attention and his deepest thought, and for a time it seemed to lie very near his heart. But finding it utterly impossible to secure this result, he abandoned his Utopian scheme. On returning to Holland, Grotius gave large attention to the doctrines of Arminius, more so than ever before. He carefully studied Calvinism, with its necessitated will, predestination and reprobation, and its final perseverance of the saints; and Arminianism, with its freedom of will, its salvation by grace on the exercise of faith in Jesus Christ, provision of salvation for all men, and individual responsibility,—and fully adopted a belief in Arminianism as the only true solution of the problem of salvation. He commenced to write for it, and to advocate it publicly, and demanded for it the largest toleration. His great thoughts for toleration, for the truth of Arminian doctrine, for freedom of the will, for the possibility of the salvation of all people, rang out in words that arrested and demanded attention. His written words were equal

to his spoken words. Men listened when he spoke, and read what he wrote. We have no means at present for determining how much the final success of Arminianism depended upon his arguments.

Grotius became one of the strong supporters of Arminianism. He was an eloquent disputant. Any antagonist found him a foeman worthy of his steel. In the latter part of his discussions and writings he introduced some novelties in explaining and enforcing his principles which were not satisfactory to the rigid Arminians, nor are they held by the Arminians of to-day. However, he was to the last an Arminian, and ventured everything upon its altar. Having by his persistency gained the ill-will of Prince Maurice, he was arrested and placed in the Fortress of Loewenstein, which was built at the extremity of an island formed by the Maas and the Waal. From the authorities his wife had permission to remain a part of the time with him in prison, but his son was not permitted to come near. During the eighteen months of imprisonment his great solace was study. He was allowed to have books brought in by a vessel, and landed at the foot of the fortress, and a large box in which they came was taken to his room. This box was filled usually with books that were not wanted, and sent back to the mainland. On the occasion of sending back a box which was pretty large, the guards examined it rather carefully, to observe that nothing was concealed that was contraband. His wife ob-

served that, after a time, the soldiers became very lax in their examinations of the box, which kept coming and going on an average of about once a week. On one occasion she persuaded her husband to get into the box, which he did, and she made it fast, when it was carried to the wharf and on board the vessel, and to the mainland, where it was awaited by friends, who received it very carefully and took it to a place of safety, where they took Grotius from his confinement in time to save his life. After being secreted in the town for some time, he went to France as the best place for safety. His wife was retained in prison for a few weeks after his flight, and then set at liberty for the reason that they had no authority for detaining her. She soon joined her husband in France. Grotius was received quite kindly by King Louis XIV in France, who granted him a pension, which was not, however, very regularly paid. After many changes in fortune, he went to Rostock, and died on the 28th of August, 1645. His body was carried back to Delft, and deposited in the grave of his ancestors. His works form a valuable contribution to the subject of theology, especially in the discussion of the doctrines of Arminianism as compared with the doctrines of Calvinism.

JOHN VAN OLDEN BARNEVELDT.

John Van Olden Barneveldt was one of the illustrious successors of the great James Arminius, and

strongly advocated his doctrine as a statesman. He was a layman, an office-holder, a citizen of great influence, used to communion and intercourse with the great and cultured ones of earth, and yet never for a moment forgot his duties to God and strong adherence to Arminianism. For his devotion to the cause of Arminianism and toleration, he paid the cost with a martyr's death. His life has been admirably written by Motley, and I will not repeat it.

FIVE POINTS AND FIVE ARTICLES.

We are brought, at this point, to the period of conflict between the two great systems of doctrine before the States of Holland and West Friesland, which occurred in 1610. The representatives of these two strong States were assembled in a legal Conclave. The Calvinists held to what was called the Five Points: 1st. Unconditional Election; 2d. Atonement Limited to the Elect; 3d. Depravity Total as to Ability and Merit; 4th. Effectual Calling or Irresistible Grace; 5th. Perseverance of the Saints. These in their interpretation embodied the objectionable elements of the Calvinistic theory. The Arminians laid before this Assembly of Representatives their protest to these Five Points, in Five Articles. They were carefully considered by the Arminians, were drawn up by Uytenbogaert, and signed by forty-five ministers, and received the name of Remonstrance. The Calvinists, realizing the force of their statements, and knowing that by

some means their power must be parried or wholly broken, issued a Counter-remonstrance. Here the world had two names for the two theological parties; namely, the Remonstrants, who were called Protestants against Calvinism; and the Counter-Remonstrants, who were the same as the Calvinists, or, as they were sometimes called in Holland, the Gomarists.

These Five Articles are worthy of a place in all Arminian works of theology; for they are the real foundation of the doctrine, and by them all purporting to be Arminianism may be critically tried.

ARTICLE I.

That God, by an eternal, unchangeable purpose in Jesus Christ his Son, before the foundation of the world, hath determined, out of the fallen, sinful race of men, to save in Christ, for Christ's sake and through Christ, those who, through the grace of the Holy Ghost, shall believe on this his Son Jesus, and shall persevere in this faith, and obedience of faith, through his grace, even to the end, and, on the other hand, to leave the incorrigible and unbelieving in sin and under wrath, and to condemn them as alienate from Christ, according to the word of the Gospel in John iii, 36: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him,"—and according to other passages of Scripture also.

ARTICLE II.

That, agreeably thereto, Jesus Christ, the Savior of the world, died for all men and for every man, so that he has obtained for them all, by his death on the cross, redemption and the forgiveness of sins; yet that no one actually enjoys that forgiveness of sins except the believer according to the word of the Gospel of John iii, 16: “God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life;” and in the First Epistle of John ii, 2: “And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.”

ARTICLE III.

That man has not saving grace of himself, nor of the energy of his free will, inasmuch as he, in the state of apostasy and sin, can, of and by himself, neither think, will, nor do anything that is truly good, such as saving faith eminently is; but that it is needful that he be born again of God in Christ through his Holy Spirit, and renewed in understanding, inclination or will, and all his powers, in order that he may rightly understand, think, will, and effect what is truly good, according to the word of Christ, John xv, 5: “Without me ye can do nothing.”

ARTICLE IV.

That this grace of God is the beginning, continuance, and accomplishment of all good, even to

this extent, that the regenerate man himself, without prevenient or assisting, awakening, following, and co-operative grace, can neither think, will, nor do good, nor withstand any temptation to evil; so that all good deeds or movements that can be conceived must be ascribed to the grace of God in Christ. But as respects the mode of the operation of this grace, it is not irresistible, inasmuch as it is written concerning many that they have resisted the Holy Ghost—Acts vii, and elsewhere in many places.

ARTICLE V.

That those who are incorporated into Christ by a true faith, and have thereby become partakers of his life-giving Spirit, have thereby full power to strive against Satan, sin, the world, and their own flesh, and to win the victory, it being understood well that it is ever through the assisting grace of the Holy Ghost, and that Jesus Christ assists them through his Spirit in all temptations, extends to them his hand, and if only they are ready for the conflict, and desire his help and are not inactive, keeps them from falling, so that they, by no craft or power of Satan, can be misled nor plucked out of Christ's hands, according to the word of Christ, John x, 28: "Neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." But whether they are capable, through negligence, of forsaking again the first beginnings of their life in Christ, or again returning to this present evil world, of

turning away from the holy doctrine which was delivered them, of losing a good conscience, of becoming devoid of grace,—that must be more particularly determined out of the Holy Scriptures, before we ourselves can teach it with the full persuasion of our minds.

These Articles, thus set forth and taught, the Remonstrants deem agreeable to the Word of God, tending to edification, and, as regards this argument, sufficient for salvation, so that it is not necessary or edifying to rise higher or to descend deeper.

DOCTRINES REJECTED.

The doctrines rejected by these five Arminian propositions before the States Assembly are stated as follows :

1. That God has, before the Fall, and even before the creation of men, by an unchangeable decree, foreordained some to eternal life, and others to eternal damnation, without any regard to righteousness or sin, to obedience or disobedience, and simply because it so pleased him, in order to show the glory of his righteousness and his mercy to the other. (This is the Supralapsarian view.)

2. That God, in view of the Fall, and in just condemnation of our first parents and their posterity, ordained to exempt a part of mankind from the consequences of the Fall, and to save them by his free grace; but to leave the rest, without regard to

age or moral condition, to their condemnation, for the glory of his righteousness. (The Sublapsarian view.)

3. That Christ died, not for all men, but only for the elect.

4. That the Holy Ghost works in the elect by irresistible grace, so that they must be converted and saved; while the grace necessary and sufficient for conversion, faith, and salvation is withheld from the rest, although they are eternally called and invited by the revealed will of God.

5. That those who have received this irresistible grace can never totally and finally lose it, but are guided and preserved by the same grace to the end.

“These doctrines, the Remonstrants declare, are not contained in the Word of God nor in the Heidelberg Catechism, and are unedifying—yea, dangerous—and should not be preached to Christian people.”

In these Five Articles we have set forth election and condemnation, conditioned upon the faith or unbelief of men; the atonement, by vicarious or expiatory offering, was not to be esteemed as limited to any definite number, but was made sufficient for the salvation of all men; man, unaided by the Holy Spirit, is unable to come to God; all the influences of divine grace can be resisted by all men, so that the desire of God for the individual salvation of a person may be defeated; and that it was

possible for a believer, who has been in full sympathy with God and accepted of him, totally to apostatize, and finally fall away and go down to eternal damnation. The Remonstrants declared these Five Articles to be "in harmony with the Word of God, edifying, and, as far as they go, sufficient for salvation."

Thus were brought face to face the two great systems of doctrines as antagonistic to each other as darkness and light; and upon the issues of these, the Calvinists on the one hand, and the Arminians on the other, rested their faith. The Calvinists demanded the support of the State, and that there should not be toleration of other sentiments; the Arminians demanded that there should be perfect toleration, and that the State should not decide the one or the other as being true. Calvinism ever sought for an alliance with and aid from the State; Arminianism has never sought for an alliance with the State, or special aid and defense from the State.

In the Assembly of representatives of West Holland and Friesland the vote was overwhelmingly against the Arminians. They were banished from their places; many of their ministers went forth into the world without any protection whatever. "The victory of orthodoxy was obscured," says Dr. Schaff, "by the succeeding deposition of about two hundred Arminian clergymen, and by the preceding, though independent, arrest of the political leaders of the Remonstrants, at the instigation of

Maurice." As we have already seen, Grotius was condemned to perpetual imprisonment, but escaped and fled to France. That grand old statesman and political leader, John of Barneveldt, was unjustly condemned to death for alleged high treason, and beheaded at The Hague, March 14, 1619, by the direction of Prince Maurice.

"It is greatly to be doubted whether this victory gained over the Arminians," says Mosheim, "was, upon the whole, advantageous or detrimental to the Church of Geneva in particular, and the Reformed Church in general. It is at least certain that, after the Synod of Dort, the doctrine of absolute decrees lost ground from day to day, and its patrons were put to the hard necessity of holding fraternal communion with those whose doctrine was either professedly Arminian, or at least nearly resembled it. The leaders of the vanquished Arminians were eminently distinguished for their eloquence, sagacity, and learning; and being highly exasperated by the injurious and oppressive treatment which they met with in consequence of their condemnation, they defended themselves and attacked their adversaries with such spirit and vigor, and also with such dexterity and eloquence, that multitudes were persuaded of the justice of their cause. It is particularly to be observed that the authority of the Synod of Dort was far from being universally acknowledged among the Dutch; the provinces of Friesland, Zealand, Utrecht, Guelder-

land, and Groningen could not be persuaded to adopt its decisions; and though, in the year 1651, they were at length gained over so far as to intimate that they would see with pleasure the Reformed religion maintained upon the footing on which it had been placed and confirmed by the Synod of Dort, yet the most eminent adepts in Belgic jurisprudence deny that this intimation had the force or character of a law." (Mosheim, Part II, Sec. 2, page 605, Edition of Applegate & Co.)

CHAPTER IV.

ARMINIAN WRITERS.

The Second Class of Arminian Writers—The Revolt from Calvinism in the Netherlands—Stephen Curcellæus—Educated at Geneva—How affected by the Doctrines of Arminianism—Visit to the Schools of Helvetia, Turin, Basle, and Cologne—Godfrey—Ordained—Preacher at Fontainebleau—Removed to Amiens—Refused to subscribe to the Canons of Dort—Contentions—Poelenburg's Funeral Oration on Curcellæus—Senate of Alesia—Appeal to the National Synod—The Articles of the National Synod of France—Curcellæus at Amsterdam—Successor of Episcopius as Professor of Divinity at Amsterdam—Leaning towards the Grotian View of the Atonement—Death—Philip Van Limborch—Relative of Episcopius—Student at Amsterdam and Utrecht—Voetius—Limborch a Professor of Divinity at Amsterdam: His Literary Character—Limborch's Systematic Theology—Kitto's Estimate of Limborch—The Remonstrants' College—Its Founding—Episcopius the First President—Successors: Curcellæus, Poelenburg, Limborch, LeClerc, Van Cattenburgh, Wettstein—The Remarks of Modern European Writers on Arminianism—Hagenbach—Van Oosterzee—Treatment of the Banished Arminian Preachers—Spies—Calder's Account—Næranus—Ryckewart—An Old Patriot abused—Troops fired on Arminian Worshipers—Inhuman Treatment of the Women—A Religious Service held on the Ice—The Worshipers came on Skates—The Ice Bird.

THE second class of Arminian writers were strong-minded, thoroughly cultured, and courageous men, who, becoming possessed of the idea that

Calvinism was an error and that the doctrines of Arminius were tenable, were willing to promulgate that fact to the world at all times. While they did not always express themselves in the same terms, but by use of different terms seemed to advocate some things not held in common, yet when their writings are sifted, collated, and compared, there is found running through all the same doctrines regarding freedom of the will, original sin, corruption of the race, and salvation provided so as to make it possible for all men, by repentance and faith, to come to a knowledge of the truth, and to eternal salvation in Jesus Christ.

The revolt from the doctrine of Calvinism was nearly or quite as great in the Netherlands as the revolt of Luther and Melanchthon from the Roman Catholic Church. The general intelligence was much greater among the Calvinists at this time than among the Romanists when Luther revolted from the system of that Church. The revolt of Arminius, Episcopius, and their compeers and successors, was greater, in its intellectual character, than that of Luther and Zwingli. In the revolt of Luther and Zwingli, they met a denser ignorance and a greater amount of impenetrable superstition among the Roman Catholics than the Arminians met when they came in contact with the teachings of the Reformers. The fact of the greater intelligence must be recognized as a factor when we come to consider what had to be met and overcome by

the Arminians in their attempt to obtain toleration and equal privileges to worship God.

Let us follow the lives and teachings of some of the more prominent successors of Arminius—the men upon whom the burden rested of defending these principles—and discover the relations they bore to each other in a common conflict, and also learn somewhat of the estimate more recent scholars have placed upon their work.

STEPHANUS CURCELLÆUS.

Stephanus Curellæus was a strong and clear writer of dogmatic theology on the side of Arminianism. His voice and pen were heard in antagonism to the rigid and unpalatable doctrines of John Calvin. He was born at Geneva, that center of Calvinism, April 30, 1586. His father was Firminius Curcellæus, a citizen of Amiens, whose death occurred very soon after the birth of his son. A brother of Stephanus was an attorney in Amiens, and possessed such force of eloquence that he “was commonly called ‘Chrysostom,’ ‘the Golden-mouthed.’” Curcellæus came of an intellectual family, which had suffered much in the Roman persecutions for the cause of Protestantism. The education of Curcellæus was begun and carried forward at Geneva. He entered the “Genevese Stoa,” and faithfully prosecuted his studies in history, philosophy, and science. In all of these he made rapid and solid progress. Beza, the man who in-

tensified John Calvin's spirit, was his first teacher in theology, and we need not doubt that he heard and received predestination of the strongest character. He remained at Geneva for a number of years, enjoying the excellent opportunity for study and culture, and well improved his time. In the independent air of that grand Genevan city there was something that thrilled his heart and stirred his mind to recognize the greatness of God's provisions for human salvation, and the right of toleration in matters of religion. Feeling the need for a broader view of the world of letters, he received from his Genevan instructors a strong letter of commendation, in which they spoke of his great talents, which were of no inferior order, and the prospect that, under the blessing of God, great fruits would result to the world from the use of such talents. Armed with this excellent letter he started upon his European travels. He visited the academies of Helvetia, Turin, Basle, and Cologne, remaining at each for a season, that he might learn the peculiarities and excellencies of each. After this he went to Heidelberg, where he remained a longer time, and became intimately acquainted with the justly celebrated Dionysius Godfrey, "professor juris," of whose learning and lectures he speaks in the highest terms. By this means Curellæus brought into close connection the Reformed and the Lutheran theology. These he studied in parallel columns, and, being of an inde-

pendent cast of mind, he drew his own conclusions as to the Scripturalness and reasonableness of each. It is possible, though not definitely known, that it was in this comparison that his great change of mind occurred, in which he determined ultimately to abandon his faith in a limited provision for salvation, and turn to a universal provision of salvation in Jesus Christ.

Having returned to France in 1614, he was ordained a minister and placed in charge of Fontainebleau, a small but intelligent congregation, which grew quite rapidly under his careful ministrations. Often the King of France was found in his congregation, with many of his courtiers; for he loved to visit this, the place of his birth and his early home. The influence of Curcellæus in matters of religion and faith grew continually, and the circle of his power widened. The revolt from Calvinism had begun, and as his mind rested upon the provisions for salvation, and he analyzed carefully the Word of God, and saw that in the teaching of the Divine Mind there was the recognition of the principle of reasonableness, the greater the revolt in his mind, and the wider became the breach between him and Calvinism. Rigid predestination and a necessitated will, and a declaration that all men were guilty of Adam's sin, found but little upon which to rest as a sure basis when he came to examine the Word of God.

When he removed to Amiens in 1621, and be-

came the pastor, he refused "to subscribe to the Canons of Dort." The Calvinists, who were in the ascendancy, compelled him to resign his charge. His friends, who greatly prized his words of wisdom and eloquent addresses, interceded with him until he consented to assent to a modified form of the Creed of Dort. This having been accomplished, he became pastor at Verres, in Piedmont, in which Church he exercised his office until 1634.

The mind of Curcellæus was active in an effort to stand by the Creed of Calvin, and so please some of his warm personal friends; but the inner revolt of his heart continued. "The doctrine of absolute predestination" filled his thoughts and harassed his soul with doubts and fears, until he found that he could not continue in a Church where he must advocate such a doctrine. Turning his back upon his home and the places he loved in the Reformed Church, he proceeded to Amsterdam, and cast his lot with the Remonstrants. His learning, candor, and gentleness gave him reputation among the Amsterdam Remonstrants and the professors in the college.

That we may have a clear idea of how this theologian had to contend for his convictions regarding Arminianism, as also how other Remonstrants were persecuted and constantly annoyed by the intense and dogmatic Reformed, I will quote a passage from Arnold Poelenburg's "Funeral Oration upon Stephen Curcellæus." "When this reverent man was

installed pastor of the Church at Amiens, about the year 1621," says Poelenburg, "the dispute concerning the five controverted points on predestination was raging, and had extended itself even to the neighboring nations; but although the Synod of Dort decided these controversies according to the wishes of our adversaries—of whom, indeed, it consisted—yet the flame of the quarrel was not quenched, but it blazed more furiously even than before. In Belgium, after this decision had been made, it came so far within the limits of moderation (if, indeed, it could be called moderation) that unless any one would submit to the Canons of Dort, he could not remain in discharge of his duties and office; but in France (whence no one had been sent to the Synod, the king having forbidden this) the matter proceeded so far that an oath was prescribed in support of the Canons established at Dort. This decree was given in the Senate at Alesia, Peter Molinæus, the president, especially urging it, lest, indeed, his anatomy of Arminianism should have to undergo a new anatomizing. Such a decree, so very cruel and most atrocious, I think, from the first days of Christianity to the present time, never was found or known; for not only did the Judgment of Dort establish a rule of faith, but it also bound, by a very sacred oath, the consciences of the pastors to a promise, given in their own handwriting, to recognize these Canons of Dort as divine, and true, and abiding, even to the last mo-

ment of their lives. To this decree, which was enacted in a National Synod in the year 1620, not only Curcellæus, at Amiens, and David Blondellus, then the pastor of the Church at Houda, afterward the professor of Ecclesiastical History at Amsterdam, but all the ministers of that diocese, rendered earnest opposition. Here, indeed, this solemn ceremony of an oath was abolished ; but in the following year, in another provincial Synod, a new instrument was formed, by which all were constrained to receive the faith of the Canons, but without the taking of an oath. Curcellæus, perceiving that our opinion would be rejected, which he had not yet submitted to the test of Scripture, and that the Remonstrants would be condemned as guilty of schism, whom he believed to be the least worthy of this accusation, and that conscience would be bound by the establishment of men when it belonged to God alone, declared himself unable by hand or mind to yield assent to it ; and soon after he resigned his office, appealing to the National Synod, soon to be celebrated at Charenton, which he did by the advice of his friends and relations, influenced by some trickery in the Synod, who threatened that, unless he should do this of his own free will, the Synod would brand him with the severer mark of ignominy. But when this Synod was held, affairs were grievously disturbed in this our Belgium ; neither was there a place of refuge, either by sea or land, or a gleaming hope of happier times. Some like-

wise instilled a doubt in his mind concerning the foreknowledge of God, upon which he was not entirely settled, and from which stronghold they were attempting to overthrow the idea of God's predestination. His relations, friends, and advisers, with other importunate interferers, added their influence, and urged his wavering and doubtful mind that he should surrender his own conscience with his own handwriting, into servitude to certain sacred Canons, but with these reservations in the conditions : 1. That he should not be held as condemning the Remonstrants, an act to which he expressed himself very averse; 2. That he could not wholly approve these Canons, in which our opinion was rejected. The remaining ones, which they called affirmative, in which their opinion was expressed, he could not be held to approve in the same sense as the partisans of Dort; for the Synod having omitted the former, published the latter under the title, 'Articles adopted at the National Synod of the Reformed Church of France, held at Charenton—printed at Paris.' Finally, he declared that from Canon XV, chapter i, it seemed that God is the author of sin." (Methodist Quarterly Review, 1863, pp. 103, 104.)

At Amsterdam, Curcellæus became an intimate friend of Simon Episcopius. He was as a "brother beloved." On the death of Episcopius, he became his successor as professor of Divinity in Amsterdam College. In this office he was unusually successful.

His great mind was able to use the rich stores of information it had gathered in past years, and pour this out in a copious, ever-flowing stream for the instruction and edification of the many students who assembled in that honorable city. His teaching was recognized by the Calvinists as unanswerable, and by the Remonstrants as a strong intrenchment of their doctrines. While, on the doctrine of the character of the atonement, he leaned somewhat to the Grotian view, yet he set a special "emphasis upon the sacrificial character of the death of Christ in its reference to God as well as to man, asserting that Christ made satisfaction for sin, but not by enduring the whole punishment due to sinners." Curcellæus held steadily to the one great thought of the freedom of the will and an unlimited atonement. He sought for and advocated toleration. While he was reared and educated in the hot-bed of anti-toleration he perceived very clearly the nature of human rights, the character of God's teachings, individual responsibility, and the circumstances under which the highest intellectual and spiritual results would follow, and he adopted and advocated the doctrine of the freest toleration of all sects.

When the death-hour came, in 1659, he exclaimed: "My God, my Father! for this hour all things are well. I am calmly composed—I am exultant!" Thus this great Remonstrant teacher passed away.

REMONSTRANTS' COLLEGE AT AMSTERDAM.

It may not be amiss to speak of the Remonstrants' College in Amsterdam, founded in 1634 by the action and sacrificing of the Remonstrants. Simon Episcopius was called from Rotterdam to act as Divinity professor. His lectures to the students were published, after his death, under the title of "Theological Institutes." The principles upon which Episcopius lectured are well stated in his Memoirs: "In this work he not only proposed to investigate the truth of every Christian doctrine, but also to ascertain its importance. This he did with a design of preparing the way for exhibiting the common ground on which the peace and unity of the Christian Church might be founded. Theologians in general are accustomed to hold it to be sufficient to demonstrate the truth of their doctrines, and prove the falsehood or heterodoxy of others, merely for the purpose of showing why they ought not to separate from the parties whose opinions do not accord with their own. Episcopius thought differently, and asserted that it was possible for divines and Christians to have a diversity of opinions and yet hold Church fellowship, or, at least, to cultivate friendly intercourse with each other. This he attempted to prove by showing that the points debated among orthodox Christians were not such as to place the party who maintained an opinion opposite to the other in a situation that

might endanger his safety; but, on the contrary, holding and publicly confessing all the great points of truth necessary to salvation, they were bound by the dictates of Christianity to cherish the principles of concord and brotherly affection." (Memoirs of Simon Episcopius, pp. 423, 424.)

The gentle spirit of Episcopius manifested itself in his great desire to bring all people professing Christianity into the spirit of friendship and union. While preparing his work and giving it to his classes and to the world, this grand object was never lost sight of for a moment. "In endeavoring to effect this, he first examined a doctrinal point, to determine its character. This prepared the way for him to show how far there must be an agreement of opinion upon it in order to maintain union and fellowship, and, by consequence, to what extent diversity of sentiment might be allowed before the great bonds of union should be broken down, and a person be pronounced unsuitable for Christian communion. It was his design to bring to this trial every doctrinal subject, in order to show that all those who separated from the Church of Rome, and maintained orthodox principles, might agree upon the great and weighty doctrines of our common Christianity." (Memoirs, p. 424.)

The line of successors in the professorship of Divinity at Amsterdam is worthy of record and study. Simon Episcopius, Stephanus Curcellæus, Arnold Poelenburg, Philip Limborch, John LeClerc, Adrian

Van Cattenburgh, John James Wettstein, follow in a line of succession as glorious in its character and as religious in its spirit as it was high and exalted in its intellectual character. These were men of great culture, strong common sense, high natural ability, and intensity of purpose. They were not mediocres in any sense whatever, but men of brain, heart, conscience, and conviction. They were men who held constant communion with heaven, and lived under the influences of the Holy Spirit. Such men left their sensible impress upon the great revolt from Calvinism which took its form from Arminianism. Long may their memory live, and their deeds and doctrines be held in the highest esteem!

MODERN WRITERS AND ARMINIANISM.

How have modern European and other writers esteemed Arminianism and its influence? Schleiermacher has used this language: "The Arminian principle, which renounced the authority of the symbolical books, gave such an impulse to exegetical investigation, to independent hermeneutical labors, and to the speculative treatment of theology, that, in consequence of the influence exerted by the works of Episcopius and Hugo Grotius, it was introduced into the whole Evangelical Church. Thus a general desire manifested itself in the Protestant Church of Germany to do away with the authority of the symbolical books." (From Hagenbach, Vol. II, p. 216.)

Within the ranks of Calvinism have been many who revolted at the harsh doctrines of iron-bound decrees. "As early as the lifetime of Calvin himself," says Hagenbach, "Sebastian Castello and Jerome Bolsec, both of Geneva, raised their voices against the Calvinistic doctrine, but did not produce any impression. The more moderate view of Arminius and his followers always had secret adherents in the Reformed Church itself." (Hagenbach, paragraph 250.)

In speaking of some of the peculiarities of Arminianism, Winer says: "The Arminians supposed a constant co-operation of the human will, awakened by Divine grace, with that grace; but, in their opinion, the influence of the latter is by no means merely of a moral nature. It is the power of the Holy Spirit accompanying the Word of God which exerts an influence upon the mind and is supernatural as regards its nature, but analogous to the natural power of all truth as regards the mode of its operation." (Quoted by Hagenbach, Sec. 249.)

Van Oosterzee has these words in reference to Arminianism: "We find at this period the study of dogmatics carried on by the Arminians from their standpoint with much zeal and skill. Among the dogmatists of this school stand out in particular Episcopius, Curcellæus, and Philip Limborch, whose theology has not incorrectly gained the renown of being Biblical, irenical, and practical. We see these men, while relatively free from scholasticism,

tread a more exegetical path, guided by the light of Hugo Grotius, their most distinguished apologist and commentator. Even where we can not admit their premises, we can hardly deny that their method is far superior to that of many other contemporaries. We must, at least, call it unjust to name them, as has often been done, in the same breath as the Socinians, though we can not deny that at least their later representatives have been also the forerunners of rationalism." (Van Oosterzee's *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 42.)

TREATMENT OF BANISHED PREACHERS.

The treatment received by the banished preachers of the Netherlands, who were driven out by the action of the Synod of Dort when they repudiated Arminianism, and the treatment which their families received from the same source, and the meek and kindly spirit in which it was met and endured by these Remonstrants, are evidences of the intolerant character of the Reformed, and the gentler spirit of the Arminians. It was decided that whatever banished minister returned should be seized and imprisoned, or banished again, without the opportunity of ever visiting his beloved home. He must wander an exile on the face of the earth, and die unloved and unrespected. Spies were paid for hunting down those who were suspected of returning to their homes. Large rewards were given to individuals who detected persons, either in allowing

public services to be held in their houses, or those who were present at such assemblies, or found in any way by their public conduct to sanction the cause of Arminianism. "One proclamation followed another," says Calder, "each more severe than the last, imposing fines upon those who dared to meet for such a purpose, while to harbor an Arminian minister, or show him any act of kindness, or suffer him to perform any religious duty in a family, to pray with a dying person, exposed the head of it to the heaviest fines, and such ministers to imprisonment or banishment. Persons known either to collect or contribute money to the support of the deprived or banished ministers were visited with the heaviest penalties."

"The wife of Næranus, an Arminian clergyman, when dying, petitioned the magistrates of the city to allow her husband to come and visit her before her death, which was refused. This occasioned spies to be constantly around her house, and even to get up to the windows to look into the dying woman's room, supposing that if her husband heard of her state, his affection would prompt him at all risk to come to her bedside. But he was unacquainted with her condition, and therefore they were disappointed."

"Ryckewart, one of the cited ministers who was banished, having got to hear that his wife was dying, and that her request to allow him to visit her was not granted, hastened to see her, though he

made himself liable to perpetual imprisonment by returning into Holland, and, after traveling to the place where she resided, got some friend to put him into a very large basket or wicker hamper, and carry him in open day to her house, where he staid with her till she died." (*Memoirs of Episcopius*, p. 363.)

"A venerable man, an inhabitant of Leyden, who was detected in allowing a meeting to be held in his house, and in contributing to the support of the exiled Remonstrant ministers, was summoned before the magistrates, banished the town, and condemned in a fine of one thousand gold reals for suffering this meeting to be held; then in six hundred guilders for collecting money for the ministers, and twenty-five more for refusing to declare the names of those who were present at the meeting. This man, it should be understood, had long been attached to the doctrines of Arminius, and so early as 1574, when the town of Leyden was besieged by the Spaniards, he was one of those who, on that occasion, not only took part with his fellow-citizens in that display of courage and endurance of suffering, of which nothing in the annals of modern history furnishes any parallel, but also rendered other essential services in the defense of the city, throughout the whole of the trying period of the siege." (*Calder*, p. 364.)

The stories told by creditable historians of the savagery of these times are almost beyond cre-

dence. Some of them rival the atrocities of a few years before, when Spanish Catholics, under Alva and his minions, fired upon the defenseless Protestants, beat out the brains of many, piked, hung, and burned others. The Counter-Remonstrant party hated, hunted, and destroyed the peaceful men of the Remonstrant party. Calvinist Protestants were destroying Arminian Protestants.

Persecution can not always put a stop to the preaching of a pure gospel and the growth of the Church. This was true in Holland. "Although the Arminians were prohibited holding public worship, nevertheless, unawed by the threatened severity of the proclamations, they held their religious meetings," says one of the writers, "throughout the whole of the United Provinces, and especially in Holland. They were held in towns and villages, in houses and barns, in garrets and cellars, in fields and highways, in streets and gardens. This contumacy, as it was called, was highly offensive to the bigoted Counter-Remonstrant magistrates and clergy; and Maurice, though he did not assume the name of sovereign after Barneveldt's assassination, was as absolute in his dictum as any Eastern despot, and, at the request of the magistrates he had created in the place of the Remonstrants, sent troops to enable them to suppress these assemblies. The reader may judge of the strength of the Arminians in Rotterdam, when he is informed that the first time they held a meeting, in a field some few

miles from the town, not less than five thousand of them assembled to hear preaching. The Calvinist party were enraged at this, and determined to take vengeance the next Sunday. After keeping the gates of the city closed to a period far beyond the usual hour, two troops of English and Scotch soldiers were led out to disperse about two thousand persons who had met to hear a sermon, on which occasion they fired upon the people. Some were killed, and others received serious wounds, of which they afterwards died. Several gentlemen, with the muzzles of the soldiers pointed at their breasts, were robbed of their purses, the ladies stripped of their jewels and rings, while others were treated in a way not to be named ; and what forms the darkest picture of the scene, was the fact of some of the Calvinistic clergy viewing it from the tops of their churches by the aid of their perspective glasses, and wantonly enjoying these deeds of blood and slaughter." (Memoirs of Episcopius, pp. 367-368.)

These courageous Christians, followers of the doctrines of Arminius, who was only restoring the apostolical faith, found ways of eluding the cruel persecutors, and enjoying a season of refreshing worship. "Toward the latter end of the year, in consequence of the usual rains which fell at that season, the people were prevented from holding their meetings in the fields, but as soon as the frost set in, they took their skates, and in vast numbers

flew to some distance, and celebrated divine worship on the ice uninterrupted, for no civil officer or soldier could overtake any number of persons thus provided with the means of escape over a vast extent of country, submerged in water, which was frozen over at this period of the year. Here the people joyfully and undisturbed sang their psalms, and listened with attention to their minister's sermon, after which a certain number of them always accompanied him on their skates to his home. One of these engaged in this service was a favorite with the people, and went by the name of "The Ice Bird." The magistrates, in order to bring contempt on the labors of these devoted pastors, called their field-preaching "Hedge Sermons." (*Memoirs of Episcopius*, pp. 370-371.)

God seemed to have a great work for these sturdy Dutch Arminians to perform, and when their way seemed hedged up he opened new ways, and gave them the courage of the martyrs.

CHAPTER V.

DOCTRINAL CONTROVERSIES.

Vigilant Enemies of Arminianism—Theodore Beza—Theological Conditions at the Time of the Controversy—Calvinism Supreme in the Reformed Church—A Standing Menace to Rome—Predestination before Augustine—New Testament Idea of Predestination—Pelagius, the Monk of Wales—Met Augustine at Hippo—Augustine—Gottschalk—Luther and Melanchthon repudiated Predestination—John Calvin—Calvin's Master Works—Zwingli—The Genius of Calvin—Students went to Geneva to study—Modification in Calvinism—Doctrine as taught by Arminius—Statements of Dr. W. F. Warren—Quotations from the Works of Arminius—First Aspect of Predestination—Reasons for rejecting Calvinism—Second Aspect of Supralapsarianism—Reasons against it—Third Phase, or Sublapsarianism—Reasons against it—Watson's Teaching—Some made a Cloak of Arminianism to teach Heretical Doctrines—Arminianism in Contact with Socinianism—Arminianism in Contact with Pelagianism—Arminianism holds to a Trinity—Value of Arminianism to the World—Dr. Copleston's View of Arminianism.

WHEN the principles advocated by James Arminius were publicly put forth by him, there were vigilant enemies who attacked him in character and teachings, denouncing him in bitter terms, and the controversy was of an exceedingly stirring character. From Geneva, Theodore Beza, upon whose shoulders the mantle of Calvin had fallen, sent his

protest and disputants to meet and counteract, as far as possible, the work of Arminius and his followers. Gomarus a professor of Theology at Leyden, and companion in labor with Arminius, was especially active and bitter in his attacks upon the man and his teachings. All the force of argument, the plea for age and venerableness of Calvinism, and the influence of State authority was brought to bear against the apostle of salvation possible for all men. But Arminius stood firm, grounded in the well-known principles adopted by him when fully convinced by the writings of Koornhert.

HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THEOLOGICAL CONDITIONS.

I. *The theological conditions before and at the time of the controversy prepared the way for Arminianism.*

Calvinism reigned supreme in the Reformed Church. It had, by its own force, been able to rally around itself a large number of followers, until a Church was founded whose object was to advocate the principles of Calvinism, and stand against the encroachments, aggressive efforts, and tyranny of Romanism. Geneva and other Swiss cantons were fully under the domination of Calvinism. Somewhat feebly her authority was felt in France. Along the water-way of the lower Rhine into the Netherlands, her power was more fully felt and authority recognized. She had leaped the North Sea and made a home in Scotland, and was reach-

ing down to take in the English heart. Everywhere Calvinism was a standing menace to Rome, and kept in check her unholy ambition. In this respect she is worthy of the highest praise from all Protestantism. Her many Creeds and Confessions of Faith were sturdy blows against the mother of harlots, and demonstrated to the world that the Reformed faith was gaining ascendancy. Pelagianism had never founded a denomination or society, but infested portions of the Roman Catholic Church, and was beginning to find its way into the Reformed Church, whose influence could negative its teachings as far as possible. Socinus had, by the force of his eloquence, carried away, especially in Poland and Hungary, several societies from the Roman Church, and had founded some new societies which held and advocated his doctrines. His system was skillfully stated, and his adherents carried on the work with a degree of success, but they lacked the enthusiasm and consistency of both the Lutheran and Reformed Churches.

1. "Before the time of Augustine, the unanimous doctrine of the Church Fathers, so far as scientifically developed at all, was that the Divine decrees as to the fate of the individual men were conditioned upon their faith and obedience as foreseen in the Divine Mind. In the first ministry of Augustine he hinted at nothing else. Man's faith and obedience in Jesus Christ were accepted by the Father, and the sinner was justified." Such was

the New Testament doctrine in which "is a remarkable anticipation of the modern controversy." "In Paul's Epistle to the Romans," says Pope, "the apostle to the Gentiles argues against these advocates of an unconditional election, these earliest perverters of the true doctrine of the decreptive will of God. It must be always remembered that this was the object with which he wrote the three chapters in which the Predestinarians have taken refuge; they were written, in fact, as a proleptical refutation of such views. . . . St. Paul admits . . . that the ancient election was of a particular line, through which the revelation of the preparatory Gospel was to be transmitted, and in which the author of that Gospel was to appear. Undoubtedly it is hard for human reason to distinguish between the national and individual election, and between the active and persuasive will of God, in the hardening of evil men; but the distinction must be made." (Pope, Vol. II, p. 348.) The entire early Church, from Paul to Augustine, "knew in its doctrine no other election and predestination than what was conditional." The eloquent Chrysostom said: "Not of love alone, but of our virtue also. If it sprang of love alone, all would have been saved. If from our virtue alone, that would be little, and all would be lost. It was from neither alone, but from both; for the calling was not of necessity or of force." (Pope, Vol. II, page 349.)

2. Pelagius, the Monk of Wales, wandered

from England to the Continent, thence to Northern Italy, and finally down to Rome. He had become filled with the idea that man had sufficient moral power, when exercised, to enable him to please God, receive forgiveness for whatever sins he might commit, and enable him to live in a state of innocent purity, and at last enter the kingdom of heaven. In this system no Christ's atoning sacrifice was needed. Pelagius wandered over to Africa, and came to Hippo, where Augustine was bishop. Very soon the controversy between Augustine and Pelagius opened, and was carried forward with great spirit.

3. Augustine, seeing that Pelagius gave no honor or credit to the grace of God in Jesus Christ for human salvation, and believing that Pelagius thereby wholly ignored both the necessity for and fact of a Christ as a sacrifice and mediator, "with a view to enhance the glory of grace," said unequivocally, "that the salvation of the elect depends upon the bare will of God, and that his decree to save those whom he chooses to save is unconditional." The inflexible principle advocated by Augustine was, "Predestination is the preparation of grace; grace the bestowment itself." His whole system radiated from this.

4. Gottschalk, about 840 A. D., taught the unconditional reprobation or unconditional predestination of the uncalled and unsaved. He completed what Augustine left out, to make a system that

should be complete on that basis. The dogma of Gottschalk was repudiated at Mainz (A. D. 848); at Valence (A. D. 855), it received approval. "On the side of Gottschalk was Ratramnus; against him Hinckmar. It may be said that, throughout the mediæval discussions of this and kindred subjects, the tendency was in a direction opposite to that of predestinarianism; and, moreover, that the ever-growing theory of a kingdom of Christ, under one vicar, predestined to embrace the world, was itself unfavorable to any limitations of the gospel vocation. The mediæval Church, at the worst, was in spirit and practice missionary. Unions of missions and a partial call can never rationally co-exist." (Pope, Vol. II, p. 351.) Where these two theories, that of Augustine and that of Gottschalk, are joined in one, as they were by John Calvin, we have all the elements and the essence of Calvinism. When men have embraced this theory as the only solution of the problem of will and of salvation, they will encompass sea and land to advocate their doctrine, and plant their principles to live forever.

5. Luther and Melanchthon, when they first entered upon the Reformation of Germany, accepted the Augustine theory. It was not long before they discovered that, accepting Augustine's predestination to salvation of a portion of mankind unconditionally, required that they should also accept Gottschalk's predestination of the other portion of mankind to eternal perdition unconditionally. These

two liberal-minded men, whose hearts yearned for the salvation of their fellow-men and for the complete elevation of their loved Germany, started back with horror from such a conclusion, and returned to the "primitive doctrine of conditional election." Melanchthon, more radically than Luther, stood for the primitive thought and against unconditional predestination. The Lutherans generally follow Melanchthon.

6. John Calvin, at Geneva, taught in the strongest terms "unconditional election and reprobation," and built his entire theological system upon this as a basis. His master-work, "*Institutes of Christian Religion*," is a monument to his great mind and wonderful industry, at the same time serving to intensify the wonder why so great a mind could have been led into so great an error. He who endured such persecutions as fell to Calvin's lot in Paris and France, and whose great heart yearned for the salvation of his French people, one would have supposed, must have desired a greater breadth of freedom in the coming to the Lord for salvation than is represented in his system. How or why he adopted so narrow a plan of salvation, or bounded the mercy of God to sinners as he did, is an unexplained problem that the Arminian mind can not fathom. "Zwingli and Calvin," says Pope, "united in reviving the Augustinian doctrine of an individual vocation determined by a predestinating decree; but Calvin has given a permanent name to the system,

because, in fact, he gave it a distinguishing character. He laid his foundation deeper than that of his forerunner. Augustine made the eternal decree his central point; Calvin carried it up to the Absolute Being, or Absolute Sovereignty of God, from which that decree flowed. ‘Man,’ said Calvin, ‘falls by the providence of God so ordaining, but he falls through his own wickedness.’ All is of the absolute, unquestionable, despotic Sovereignty of God. If human reason suggests a demur, ‘*Respondendum est quia voluit*’—It is answered, so he wills. The decree was Supralapsarian; that is, it included the Fall, which Augustine never asserts formally. It follows from this in the system of Calvin that the external call of the gospel is unmeaning ceremonial, save as to the elect. The word and the means of grace are to all others ‘*Signa inania*,’ the manifestations of a ‘*Voluntas signi*,’ which, signifying nothing but a common grace, must be distinguished from the hidden ‘*Voluntas beneplaciti*,’ on which the salvation of every man depends. Here is the secret of predestinarianism, whatever other name it may bear, the secret that links it with fatalism, with philosophic determinism, with Pantheism, with the modern notion of abstract law, or the absolute fiat of a being who is not so much a person as a will. Other relations of this creed to theological doctrine, subordinate relations introduced in due course, all find their vanishing point in this Unconditional and Unconditioned Sovereignty,

which is the foundation and topstone of the whole superstructure." (Pope, Vol. II, pp. 351-352.)

MODIFICATIONS IN CALVINISM.

Modifications in Calvinism have occurred in all lands and ages, wherever it has traveled. In France Amyraldus revolted, and was forced to teach that, in providing salvation, God made provisions for all men, but he elected to give to a limited number the "grace of repentance and faith," and left the rest without any determining influence. Richard Baxter taught the same in England. The same was heard in Scotland. Even Calvin himself fore-saw the revolt from his predestination theory, and sought to deter men from it. It is the same spirit of revolt that within the past decade set Calvinism to seek a change in the Creed.

The genius of Calvin made his doctrine felt far and wide. The men who rallied around his standard labored hard to intensify it. That most remarkable man, Theodore Beza, was his coadjutor and successor in theological training. This man of the Reformation was of a strong and logical mind, and, having adopted Calvin's notions and thoroughly made them his own, put forth all his powers to maintain them. From 1564, when Calvin died, and Beza succeeded to all his offices, there was no lack of strong and vigorous arguments in favor of Calvinism. Beza, if so it could be, was a stronger Calvinist than Calvin. Calvinism spread into the

Netherlands, and students went from these northern countries down to Geneva for their theological studies with Beza. He did not fail to indoctrinate them soundly and thoroughly. James Arminius and Uytenbogaert received their training under this indomitable master, Beza. But they revolted, and Arminius stood as the great champion of the better, clearer, happier interpretation of God's purpose and plan in human salvation.

II. *The doctrine as taught by Arminius was “the result of long, calm, and patient study of the Scriptures,” and its statement was a clear, full, and forcible answer to predestination as taught by Augustine, Gottschalk, Calvin, and Beza.*

The state of the controversy is well put by Dr. W. F. Warren: “The great error which he [Arminius] had to combat, consisted in making the Divine efficiency with relation to one temporal phenomenon—viz., the readjustment of the disturbed relation of God and the sinner—an exception, making the action of the Divine efficiency to that phenomenon essentially unlike in relation to any other temporal phenomenon in the universe. The Church had held that every exercise of the Divine efficiency in relation to temporal phenomena, was subjectively conditioned by Divine wisdom, omniscience, and goodness. Calvinism, on the other hand, maintained that this particular exercise of Divine efficiency was absolutely unconditioned, and was grounded solely upon the arbitrary good pleasure of

God. - The refutation of this error, and the re-establishment of the opposite view, was the mission of James Arminius." (Meth. Quart. Rev., July, 1857, p. 350.)

WORDS OF ARMINIUS.

It is profitable to quote from the works of Arminius. When Arminius "was before the States of Holland, at The Hague, on the 30th of October, 1608," he gave to that honorable body a clear statement of his teachings regarding predestination, as well as other features of Calvinism. After he had clearly stated the doctrine of predestination in terms largely taken from Calvinistic writings, he proceeded to analyze the subject, and set forth their Calvinism under three forms. The first was as follows :

" 1. That God has absolutely and precisely decreed to save certain particular men by his mercy or grace, but to condemn others by his justice; and to do all this without having any regard in such a decree to righteousness or sin, obedience or disobedience, which could possibly exist on the part of one class of men or of the other.

" 2. That, for the execution of the preceding decree, God determined to create Adam, and all men in him, in an upright state of original righteousness, besides which he also ordained them to commit sin, that they might thus become guilty of eternal condemnation, and be deprived of original righteousness.

“ 3. That those persons whom God has thus positively willed to save, he has decreed not only to salvation, but also the means which pertain to it (that is, to conduct and bring them to faith in Christ Jesus, and to perseverance in that faith); and that he also in reality leads them to these results by a grace and power that are irresistible, so that it is not possible for them to do otherwise than to believe, persevere in faith, and be saved.

“ 4. That to those whom, by his Absolute Will, God has foreordained to perdition, he has also decreed to deny that grace which is necessary and sufficient for salvation, and does not in reality confer it upon them, so that they are neither placed in a possible condition, nor in any capacity of believing or of being saved.”

He says: “ I reject this predestination for the following reasons :

“ (1) Because it is not the foundation of Christianity, of salvation, or of certainty.

“ (2) This doctrine of predestination comprises within it neither the whole nor any part of the gospel.

“ (3) The doctrine was never admitted, decreed, or approved in any Council, either general or particular, for the first six hundred years after Christ.

“ (4) None of those doctors or divines of the Church who held correct and orthodox sentiments for the first six hundred years after the birth of

Christ, ever brought this doctrine forward, or gave it their approval.

“(5) It neither agrees nor corresponds with the harmony of these Confessions, which were printed and published together in one volume at Geneva in the name of the Reformed Churches.

“(6) It may very properly be made a question of doubt whether this doctrine agrees with the Belgic Confession, and the Heidelberg Catechism,” which he proceeds to demonstrate.

“(7) This doctrine is repugnant to the nature of God, particularly to those attributes of his nature by which he performs and manages all things, his wisdom, justice, and goodness.” “Repugnant to his wisdom, because it represents God as decreeing something for a particular end, which neither is nor can be good, . . . because it states that the object which God proposed to himself by this predestination was to demonstrate his mercy and justice,” which it can not demonstrate, “except by an act that is contrary at once to his mercy and justice, of which description is that decree of God in which he determined that man should sin, and be miserable. It is repugnant to the justice of God, . . . affirming that God has absolutely willed to save certain individual men, and has decreed their salvation, without having the least regard to righteousness or obedience; . . . the proper inference from which is, that God loves such men far more than his own justice,” and “because it

affirms that God wishes to subject his creatures to misery."

"(8) Such a doctrine of predestination is contrary to the nature of man in regard to his having been created after the Divine Image in the knowledge of God and righteousness, in regard to his having been created with a disposition and aptitude for the enjoyment of life eternal.

"(9) It is diametrically opposed to the act of creation; for creation is a communication of good according to the intrinsic property of its nature. . . . Reprobation is an act of hatred, and from hatred derives its origin, and creation does not proceed from hatred; . . . creation is a perfect act of God, by which he has manifested his wisdom, goodness, and omnipotence.

"(10) This doctrine is in open hostility with the nature of eternal life, and the titles by which it is signally distinguished in the Scriptures; for it is called the inheritance of the sons of God, but those alone of the sons of God, according to the doctrine of the gospel, who believe in the name of Jesus Christ. . . . God, therefore, has not from his own absolute decree, without any consideration or regard whatever to faith and obedience, appointed to any man, or determined to appoint to him, life eternal.

"(11) This predestination is also opposed to the nature of eternal death, and to those appellations by which it is described in the Scriptures; for it is

called ‘the wages of sin,’ the punishment of everlasting destruction, which shall be recompensed to them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ; . . . and God has not, by any absolute decree, without perfect respect to sin and disobedience, prepared eternal death for any person.

“(12) This predestination is inconsistent with the nature and properties of sin in two ways: (1) Because sin is called disobedience and rebellion, neither of which terms can possibly apply to any person who, by a preceding Divine decree is placed under an unavoidable necessity of sinning; (2) Because sin is the meritorious cause of damnation; but the meritorious cause which moves the Divine Will to reprobate, is according to justice, and it induces God, who holds sin in abhorrence, to will reprobation. Sin, therefore, which is a cause, can not be placed among the means by which God executes the decree or will of reprobation.

“(13) This doctrine is likewise repugnant to the nature of Divine grace, and, as far as its powers permit, it effects its destruction.

“(14) The doctrine of this predestination is injurious to the glory of God, for it makes God the author of sin.

“(15) This doctrine is highly dishonorable to Jesus Christ, our Savior; for it entirely excludes him from that decree of predestination which predestines the end, and argues that he is not the

foundation of election. . . . It denies that Jesus Christ is a meritorious cause that again obtained for us the salvation which we had lost, by placing him as only a subordinate cause of that salvation, which had been already foreordained, and thus only a minister and instrument to apply that salvation unto us.

“(16) This doctrine is hateful to the salvation of men, because it prevents that saving and godly sorrow for sins that have been committed, which can not exist in those who have no consciousness of sin, . . . and it removes all pious solicitude about being converted from sin unto God; . . . it restrains, in persons that are converted, all zeal and studious regard for good works, since it declares that the degenerate can not perform either more or less good than they do; . . . it extinguishes the zeal for prayer, which yet is an efficacious means instituted by God for asking and obtaining all kinds of blessings from him, but takes away all that most salutary fear and trembling with which we are commanded to work out our own salvation; . . . it produces within men a despair both of performing that which their duty requires, and of obtaining that towards which their desires are directed.

“(17) This doctrine inverts the order of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

“(18) This predestination is in open hostility to the ministry of the gospel; for if God by an irre-

sistible power quickens him who is dead in trespasses and sin, no man can be a minister and a laborer together with God, nor can the word preached of man be the instrument of grace and of the Spirit. . . . By this predestination the ministry of the gospel is made the savor of death unto death in the case of the majority of those who hear it, as well as an instrument of condemnation. . . . According to this doctrine, baptism, when administered to many reprobate children, is evidently a seal of nothing, and thus becomes useless. It hinders public prayers from being offered to God in a becoming and suitable manner. . . . The constitution of this doctrine is such as so very easily to render pastors slothful and negligent in the exercise of their ministry.

“(19) This doctrine completely subverts the foundation of religion in general, and of the Christian religion in particular.

“(20) This doctrine of predestination hath been rejected both in former times and in our own day by the greater part of the professors of Christianity.”

To the second form of predestination, which was also supralapsarian, Arminius said: “But though the inventors of this scheme have been desirous of using the greatest precaution, lest it might be concluded from their doctrine that God is the author of sin, with as much show of probability as is deducible from the first scheme, yet we shall discover that the fall of Adam can not possibly, according to their views, be considered in any other man-

ner than as a necessary means for the execution of the preceding decree of predestination. For, first, it states that God determined by the decree of reprobation to deny to man that grace which was necessary for the confirmation and strengthening of his nature, that it might not be corrupted by sin, which amounts to this, that God decreed not to bestow that grace which was necessary to avoid sin, and from this must necessarily follow the transgression of man as proceeding from a law imposed upon him. The fall of man is, therefore, a means ordained for the execution of the decree of reprobation.

"It states that the two parts of reprobation are preterition and predamnation. These two parts—although the latter views man as a sinner and obnoxious to justice—are, according to that decree, connected together by a necessary and mutual bond, and are equally extensive; for those whom God passed by in conferring grace are likewise damned. Indeed, no others are damned, except those who are the subjects of this act of preterition. From this, therefore, it must be concluded that sin necessarily follows from the decree of reprobation or preterition; because if it were otherwise, it might possibly happen that a person who had been passed by might not commit sin, and from that circumstance might not become liable to damnation. This second opinion on predestination, therefore, falls into the same inconvenience as the first—the mak-

ing God the author of sin." (Watson's Theological Institutes, Vol. II, pp. 392-393.)

The third phase of predestination is Sublapsarian, "in which man, as the object of predestination, is considered fallen." Of this Arminius tersely said : "Because God willed within himself from all eternity to make a decree by which he might elect certain men and reprobate the rest, he viewed and considered the human race, not only as created, but likewise as fallen or corrupt, and on that account obnoxious to malediction. Out of this lapsed and accursed state, God determined to liberate certain individuals, and freely to save them by his grace for a declaration of his mercy; but he resolved, in his own just judgment, to leave the rest under malediction for a declaration of his justice. In both these cases God acts without the slightest consideration of repentance and faith in those whom he elects, or of impenitence and unbelief in those whom he reprobates. This opinion places the fall of man, not as a means foreordained for the execution of the decree of predestination, as before explained, but as something that might furnish a proæresis, or occasion for this decree of predestination." (Watson's Theological Institutes, Vol. II, pp. 393-394.)

III. Arminianism, in its contact with Socinianism, was as outspoken in its antagonism to its dogma as when it sought to counteract predestination.

Arminianism did not oscillate between the two,

but maintained its attitude consistently, and dealt sturdy blows upon each, until each was made to feel the sandiness of its foundation. Socinianism held that "Christ was a man, miraculously conceived and divinely endowed, but not to receive divine worship; that the object of his death was to perfect and complete his example, and to prepare the way for his resurrection, the necessary historical basis of Christianity; that the soul is pure by nature, though contaminated by evil example and teaching from a very early age." One can not read the works of Arminius without finding a vast number of sentences opposing diametrically these Socinian doctrines. He taught the person of Jesus Christ as a perfect incarnation, a God-man. This Divine Being is the object of the most perfect worship. Jesus Christ died, not as an example, but as a vicarious sacrifice for sin. The Arminianism of Arminius and Episcopius taught, in the best and highest sense, that without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins. Here also was taught that man was not born in the world pure by nature, but by nature was corrupt. The child inherits a sinful nature. This sinful nature can only be changed and purified by the personal application of the blood of the atonement.

There were some persons at a later date who made a cloak of Arminianism to teach heretical doctrine; but they were not Arminians, and did not teach Arminianism, and should not be held account-

able to Arminianism. A full and complete atonement, perfect freedom of the will, and salvation by faith to all repenting sinners, was the kernel of Arminian teaching.

IV. Arminianism, in its contact with Pelagianism, was firm and true to the doctrines of the primitive Church.

These doctrines respecting the nature of sin, and the absolute corrupted human nature, and the dependence upon divine grace for salvation, were taught in their strongest character.

Pelagianism held that "there was no original sin through Adam, and consequently no hereditary guilt; that every soul is created of God sinless; that the will is absolutely free, and that the grace of God is universal, but is not indispensable." While Pelagius held to a Divine Trinity, he had no office for the Second Person as a Savior of man.

In every respect was Arminianism the antagonist of Pelagianism. Arminianism taught that in the sin of Adam there was such a corruption of his nature that he communicated the taint to all of his posterity, and not one is born, or ever will be born, free from the corruption of sin. Arminianism makes clear the distinction between the corruption of our nature and the guilt of Adam. It holds that the grace of God is indispensably necessary to salvation, and without it, there is no coming to the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world for personal salvation.

Arminianism says that there is a Divine Trinity,

and that the office of the Second Person of the Trinity is to make atonement for sin and reconcile God to man, thereby making it possible for all men, individually, to come to salvation and live forever. Arminianism is as distinct from Pelagianism as day is from night, even though the traducers of the system have undertaken to establish the opposite.

V. *Arminianism has been of immense value to the theological world, holding in check its extravagances, and moderating and liberalizing the harsh and illiberal spirit of Calvinism, and giving to mankind a more cheerful view of God's relations to man.*

In speaking of the services of James Arminius in developing and advocating Arminianism, that great Arminian writer, Watson, in his Institutes, says: "They preserved many of the Lutheran Churches from the tide of Supralapsarianism, and its constant concomitant, Antinomianism. They moderated even Calvinism in many places, and gave better countenance and courage to the Sublapsarian scheme, which, though logically perhaps not so much to be preferred to that of Calvin, is at least not so revolting, and does not impose the same necessities upon men of cultivating that hardihood which glories in extremes and laughs at moderation. They gave rise, incidentally, to a still milder modification of the doctrine of decrees, known in England by the name of Baxterianism, in which homage is, at least in words, paid to the justice, truth, and be-

nevolence of God. They have also left on record in the beautiful, learned, eloquent, and, above all these, the Scriptural system of theology furnished by the writings of Arminius, how truly man may be proven totally and hereditarily corrupt, without converting him into a machine or a devil; how fully secured in the scheme of the redemption of man by Jesus Christ, without making the Almighty partial, willful, and unjust; how much the Spirit's operation in man is enhanced and glorified by the doctrine of the freedom of the human will, in connection with that of its assistance by Divine grace; with how much luster the doctrine of justification by Christ shines, when offered to the assisted choice of all mankind instead of being confined to the forced acceptance of a few; how the doctrine of election, when it is made conditional on faith unforeseen, harmonizes with the wisdom, holiness, and goodness of God, among a race of beings to all of whom faith was made possible; and how reprobation harmonizes with justice when it has a reason, not in arbitrary will, the sovereignty of a pasha, but in the principles of a righteous government."

(McClintock and Strong, Vol. I, p. 415.)

DR. COPLESTON'S WORDS.

Since writing the above, I find a very fine résumé in one of the Bampton Lectures of the excellent influence of Arminianism on Lutheranism. "It is pleasing and satisfactory," says Dr. Cople-

ston, "to trace the progress of Melanchthon's opinion upon the subject [of universal redemption of mankind through the blood of Jesus Christ, by the exercise of repentance and faith of whosoever will]. In the first dawning of the Reformation, he, as well as Luther, had been led into some metaphysical discussions, which Calvin afterwards molded into a system, and incorporated with his exposition of the Christian doctrine. But so early as the year 1529 he renounced this error, and expunged the passages that contained it from the later editions of his *Loci Theologici*. Luther, who had in his early life maintained the same opinions, after the controversy with Erasmus about free will, never taught them. And although he did not, with the candor of Melanchthon, openly retract what he had once written, yet he bestowed the highest commendations on the last editions of Melanchthon's work containing this correction. He also scrupled not to assert publicly that at the beginning of the Reformation his creed was not completely settled; and in his last work of any importance he is anxious to point out the qualifications with which all he had said on the doctrine of absolute necessity ought to be received."

Having thus traced the relation of Arminianism to Calvinism, Socinianism, and Pelagianism, and having seen the influence that similar doctrines which were abroad in the world previous to the day of Arminius, had upon the minds of Luther and Melanchthon, we are prepared to say that, in our

humble judgment, Arminianism stands forth as the uncorrupted teaching of the primitive Church, the doctrine taught by the apostles, and the doctrine which they received from the Lord Jesus Christ. In no sense is Arminianism to be made responsible for the vagaries and heretical teachings of the Socinians, Pelagians, or any other sect or people, and to attempt to make them so responsible, is illogical, unwise, and sinful.

CHAPTER VI.

PRE-WESLEYAN ARMINIANISM IN EUROPE.

Three Periods to be studied: 1st. Class of Arminian Writers, Limborch and his *Theologia Christiana*; 2d. Class of Arminian Writers: Voetius, at Leyden; Vorstius, Cologne; Hume's Statement regarding Vorstius; 3d. Class of Writers—Phases of the Controversy—Not Protestantism alone rent with Discussion—Romanist Jansenists were Predestinationists—Jesuits were against Predestination—Amyraut—Objective and Subjective Grace—*Unitas Fratrum*—Modern Moravians: Zinzendorf, Peter Bohler—Mennonites—Arminian Conflict in England—Peter Baro—Sermon against the Lambeth Articles—John Playfere, a Professor at Cambridge—His Lectures on Arminianism—Dr. Samuel Hoard—Dr. John Goodwin—Bishops Laud and Juxon—Fletcher's Estimate of Laud and his Arminianism—Hallam's Account of the Theological Controversy—The Age of Theological Revolt in England—Jewell, Nowell, Sanders, and Cox—Zurich Letters—Bullinger and his Influence—James I attempts to control the Synod of Dort—Episcopal Arminian Divines: Cudworth, Pierce, Jeremy Taylor, Tillotson, Stillingfleet, etc.—Quotation as to the Theological Teaching in the Eighteenth Century.

MR. WESLEY became, in his early career, one of the most earnest and strongest advocates of James Arminius's modes of interpreting the predestinationism of his age. When this bias was given to his mind, and by what influences, history is silent; but we think, by tracing up the history of Arminianism, we shall find influences that necessa-

rily wrought upon his mind, producing this effect. It is probable that his father had something to do with this early impression, for he was in revolt from the Calvinism of the Established Church soon after John's birth; and his mother, though remaining somewhat in bondage, added to the impression of the goodness of God in providing a possible way for the salvation of a sinful soul. As Mr. Wesley studied all the phases of the Divine government with reference to men as a whole and as individuals, and grasped the greatness of the past, and then saw the magnitude of the power of God and his wonderful and inexhaustible resources, he most firmly took hold of the doctrine that "He is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him, seeing that he ever liveth to make intercession for us."

When the relation of Mr. Wesley to the revival of the Arminian doctrine is studied, there are three periods to be first considered, viz. :

I. The second class of Arminian writers and scholars.

II. Some persons who taught a corrupted, extravagant, and perverted Arminianism.

III. Pre-Wesleyan Arminianism on the Continent and in England.

I. The second class of Arminian writers and scholars were generally strong, clear-minded, and accurate defenders of the doctrine. They were men of great learning, skilled in debate, and equally

skillful in their writings. Whilst many of them were greatly persecuted, and driven from their pulpits or professors' chairs, and compelled to endure hardships bodily, they still wielded an influence that was felt for good throughout the western portion of the Continent of Europe.

Most of them were men capable of shining in any age of the world, and reflecting honor upon whatever institution or cause to which they attached their names. They left, in many cases, lucrative positions, court favor, and certain advancement, for the sake of truth and principle. They clearly recognized the sandy foundation of foreordination, and the errors of the conclusions of Supralapsarian predestination, and the spiritual poverty involved in a necessitated will, and at once abandoned them for a better, more liberal, more scientific, and more spiritual system, as found in Arminianism. Their history is worth tracing. Of the second class of Arminian writers, only one need be mentioned, who is an excellent representative of all. He was a truly great man.

PHILIP VAN LIMBORCH.

Philip Van Limborch was born in Amsterdam, June 19, 1633. He was a nephew, on his mother's side, of the great Episcopius, and inherited much of the same mental power which was possessed by this great man of the Church. His childhood was not particularly distinguished; but when he com-

menced his studies in earnest, he became well versed in ethics, history, and philosophy. After his early studies at Amsterdam, he entered the university at Utrecht, where he heard Voetius lecture on the Reformed Theology. The bias had been given to his theology while he listened to the Remonstrants at Amsterdam. From 1657, for ten years, Limborch was pastor of the Remonstrant Church at Gonda. From here he was called to Amsterdam as a pastor. His success was marked in the pastorate as a theologian, a brilliant orator, and a great-hearted man of God, who came in close contact with the common people. In 1668, he became professor of Divinity in the Remonstrant College of Amsterdam. Here his work was well received, and his influence in the Church and theological world felt to its fullest extent. His great intellectual powers had a splendid scope for their full exercise. He remained in discharge of his duties in this important official relation until April 30, 1712, when death closed his mortal career. Limborch was a man of great intellectual force, and so threw himself into his teachings and writings with enthusiasm as to have a wide circle of influence, and to leave an enduring impression upon theology for the coming generations. Staudlein, a celebrated Holland writer, says of this man: "The most complete exposition of the Arminian doctrine is the celebrated work by Philip Van Limborch, a man distinguished for genius, learning, and modesty, whose literary labors

are of great value. The very arrangement of his system displays originality. Admirable perspicuity and judicious selection of the material characterized the entire work."

"Limborch," says another writer, "was gentle in his disposition, tolerant of the views of others, learned, methodical, of a retentive memory, and above all, had a love for truth, and engaged in the search of it by reading the Scriptures with the best commentators." As a Remonstrant theologian he stood next to Arminius and Episcopius. His writings were clear, forcible, elegantly expressed, and introduced no novelties into the system as advocated by the learned Arminius. Among many works published by him, he performed his greatest feat by publishing "A Complete System or Body of Divinity, Both Speculative and Practical, Founded on Scripture and Reason." Of this work it is said: "This was the first and most complete exposition of the Arminian doctrine, displaying great originality of arrangement, and admirable perspicuity, and judicious selection of material. The preparation of this work was undertaken at the request of the Remonstrants."

Of Limborth's power as a commentator Dr. Kitto has spoken when reviewing his exegetical "Commentarius in Acta. Apos. et in Epistolas ad Romanos et ad Hebræos." "This commentary," says Kitto, "though written in the interest of the author's theological views, is deserving of attention

for the good sense, clear thought, and acute reasoning by which it is pervaded."

Limborch, among other works, published his "Theologia Christiana" in 1683, at the request of the Remonstrants. This book was a clear setting forth of a complete system of religion, and a "Book of Divinity," both speculative and practical, "founded on Scripture and reason." It was an exposition of the Arminian doctrines, and was not at variance with what had been taught, first by Arminius, and afterwards by Simon Episcopius. Of this work of Limborch's, it is said that it was "the first and most complete exposition of the Arminian doctrine, displaying great originality of arrangement, and admirable perspicuity, and judicious selection of material." The distinctions which Limborch made between Arminianism and Calvinism were very clear and exceedingly convincing. The temper with which he entered upon and prosecuted this work was all that could have been asked of any theologian by the most captious and fault-finding person. He had no hard names or unkind epithets for opponents, and did not desire to indicate that it was impossible for those who held a doctrine contrary to his own to be brought into fellowship with the Divine Jesus, and be eternally saved. There was the same liberality which had been exhibited on the part of all the great champions of Arminianism who had preceded him.

II. There were some persons who taught a cor-

rupted, extravagant, and perverted Arminianism, for which true Arminianism should not be held accountable.

GYSBURTIUS VOETIUS.

Gysburtius Voetius, D. D., was one of the earlier of the men who taught Arminianism in a distorted and unnatural manner. He was born in 1588, at Heusden, in Holland. When a student at Leyden, he listened to the teachings of both Gomarus and Arminius. He leaned to the Calvinism of Gomarus, but became well acquainted with the language of Arminius and his doctrines. In the process of time Voetius became an adept in controversy, having a taste for that kind of work. His language against Arminianism was sometimes immoderate and unkind. He had neither love nor respect for "Zwinglianism, nor Melanchthonism, and no admiration for Grotius." He called Erasmus "an Arian, Pelagian, Socinian, and skeptic." "His great ambition was the achievement of the overthrow of Arminianism, and this influenced his scholarly character as well as his general conduct. His exegesis lacked independence, and aimed less at the discovery of what constituted religious truth than at the invention of philological and other arguments to defend the system he preferred." The statements of Voetius, which were harsh and "in a barbarous, artificial terminology," and did not always have a regard for a "true statement of the doc-

trines of Arminius," had very much to do with making a "corrupted, extravagant, and perverted Arminianism."

CONRAD VORSTIUS.

Conrad Vorstius, born in 1569, at Cologne, educated at Dusseldorf and Cologne, became a doctor at Heidelberg, and was professor of Theology at Steinfurt, a situation accepted in place of the same which was offered him at Geneva. On the death of Arminius he was called to Leyden. Before this he had published "*Disputationes de Natura et Attributis Dei*," in which he championed Arminianism. The fame of this preceded him to Leyden, and, on arriving, he found his hands and head full of labor, maintaining his doctrine, especially that regarding "Christ and predestination." He seems to have very ably defended his positions, and took his place as a professor, and continued to advocate these doctrines for a number of years. His book reached England, and King James I became involved, in some way, in the controversy. "A professor of Divinity, named Vorstius," says Hume, "the disciple of Arminius, was called from a German to a Dutch university, and as he differed from his Britannic Majesty in some nice questions concerning the intimate essence and secret decrees of God, he was considered a dangerous rival in scholastic fame, and was at last obliged to yield to the legions of that royal doctor, whose syllogisms

he might have refuted or eluded. If vigor was wanting in other incidents of James's reign, here he behaved even with haughtiness and insolence; and the States were obliged, after several remonstrances, to deprive Vorstius of his chair, and to banish him from their dominions." (Hume's History of England, Vol. IV, p. 421.)

III. Pre-Wesleyan Arminianism on the Continent and in England, when traced out, is found to present three phases: 1. A leaning away from Calvinism, seemingly toward Pelagianism and Universalism. 2. An attempt to shun this appearance by leaning toward Calvinism, and yet not to Calvinism. 3. Maintaining the true position between Calvinism and Pelagianism, not in a moderate Augustinism, but in the doctrines of Arminius, to wit: "That God created man upright and pure, and placed him in a probation state, with power to endure all temptation, and ability to fall, and, when man sinned, made a way possible for all men to return to him and purity, on condition of repentance and faith, to be exercised in the utmost freedom of the will, or by the same will to be rejected."

Protestantism was not alone torn by internal dissensions and contentions regarding "grace and free will." In the Roman Catholic Church the great monastic orders, "Dominicans and Benedictines, contended for their several opinions, while in France Jesuits and Jansenists took the field of controversy, . . . the Jansenists, being the Re-

formed or Calvinistic party, while the Jesuits were the Free-will advocates." But all these parties so soon ran off on a tangent from religion into polities, that they lost sight entirely of the subject of freedom of the will and predestination.

MOSES AMYRAUT.

There was a man by the name of Amyraut, sometimes called Amyrauldus, born in Anjou in 1596, who embraced Protestantism, and became professor of Theology at Bourgueil. He started out as a strong Calvinist, but after a time it began to be whispered that his teachings regarding predestination and grace were not orthodox according to the dictum of Geneva. In 1634 he published his views, which were called Universalist and Arminian. On a careful examination of them, it is found that they are neither. They were more Calvinistic than anything else. It is claimed by those who have thoroughly investigated the subject, that he had one eye on the Lutheran doctrine, and the other on Calvinism, and he hoped to be the mediator to reconcile the two branches of Christian theology. Amyraut asserted a "gratia universalis," but he meant not what Arminius taught by the use of such a term. "He meant by it simply that God desires the happiness of all men, provided they will receive his mercy in faith; that none can receive salvation without faith in Christ, that God refuses to none the power of believing, but that he does

not grant to all his assistance, that they improve their power to saving purposes; that none can so improve it without the Holy Spirit, which God is not bound to grant to any, and, in fact, does grant only to those who are elect according to his eternal decree."

As if to show how far Amyraut was from true Arminianism, it may be said that "he distinguished between objective and subjective grace." Objective grace offers salvation to all men on condition of repentance and faith, and is universal; subjective grace operates morally in the conversion of the soul, and in particular—that is, only given to the elect. Such teaching is not Arminianism, even though branded as such by its enemies.

THE LUTHERANS TENDED TO ARMINIANISM.

We have already seen that the Lutherans, under the teaching of the polished Melanchthon, strongly sympathized with the Arminians, and not with the Calvinists. The peculiar notion of Luther regarding the Lord's Supper being "consubstantiation," tended to prevent the adoption of the Calvinistic doctrines in Germany, especially that of predestination. The Sacramental Controversy was not forgotten. It acted like a barrier against the inroads of the Reformed doctrine of Geneva. It was supposed that the rude action of the Synod of Dort had completely crushed the Arminian movement; but Ebrard says: "This outward show of victory

was really a defeat; for the true elements of Arminianism were not killed at Dort, but grew up silently but surely within the bosom of the orthodox Reformed Church."

UNITAS FRATRUM.

When we turn to the Churches of the Continent that were Arminian before the Wesleyan movement, we find the "Unitas Fratrum," United Brethren, or Moravians, standing out prominently, and clearly advocating freedom of the will and salvation provided for all men, in opposition to the predestination doctrine.

ZINZENDORF AND THE MORAVIANS.

The modern Moravians, sometimes called Herrnhutters and Zinzendorfians, had their revival in Count Zinzendorf, about 1722. Zinzendorf came in contact with some Christians of Moravia, who were compelled to flee from their native land in consequence of the religious persecutions which they suffered. Zinzendorf was a man of wealth, and owned a large territory in Germany. He invited these persecuted Christians to come there, settle, and engage in lawful business. Being moved by the Holy Spirit, he determined "faithfully to take charge of poor souls for whom Christ had shed his blood, and especially to collect together and protect those who were oppressed and persecuted." Under his godly direction, the company prospered and

increased in wealth, at the same time that they were growing in a rich religious experience. The sect became early impressed with the command of God to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. Consequently they set out for other lands to disciple them. They believed that Christ Jesus died for all mankind, and made it possible for all to come to him for salvation. This belief led them to travel to Poland, to England, to the wilds of North America, then to Africa and to the islands of the sea, to preach the gospel. In America, and afterwards in Europe, they came in contact with the Wesleys, and left a sensible impression upon them. The class of theologians raised up among the Moravians—such as Peter Böhler and Nitschmann—were strong preachers of a pure Arminianism. They taught, preached, and wrote this system in perfect accord with the purest statement of the doctrine.

MENNONITES.

The Mennonites also antedated Arminius in the advocacy of his doctrine. While originally they were called Anabaptists, and their character was doubtless marred and influenced by some practices not to be tolerated in these later days, yet, when Menno Simons effected his great Reformation, there came out a sect or people clear from all the old and vile practices, and with an evangelism worthy of imitation by the best. The Mennonites held

that "the sacrifice of Christ's death is set forth as applicable to all mankind; the Mennonite doctrine thus symbolizing with Arminianism, and not Calvinism." (Dict. of Sects, Heresies, etc., by Blunt, p. 311.)

While there have been two distinct changes in the Confession of Faith of the Mennonites up to the present time, there has been no change in the phase of the doctrines regarding original sin, predestination, freedom of the will, and the possible personal salvation of each individual human being.

ARMINIANISM IN ENGLAND.

The Arminianism conflict began in England early in the seventeenth century. Much controversy has been had as to whether the Articles of Religion, as drawn up for the Church of England, were in their design Calvinistic or Arminian. They have been held by some as strongly Calvinistic, while a few have said that they were designed to be Arminian. Whatever may have been the design, the reader of the Articles can not come to any other conclusion than that they are Calvinistic, and are the language of Geneva, and breathe the spirit of predestination in its strongest form. Cranmer is sometimes spoken of as an Arminian; but since he had much to do with the influences shaping the Articles of Religion of the Church of England, somewhere his Arminianism became greatly perverted into Calvinism.

PETER BARO.

Peter Baro, a Frenchman of culture, was made "Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity" in Trinity College, Cambridge. He opposed predestination as taught by the Calvinists, and continued to advocate "free will and salvation possible to all men," until in 1595 the Calvinists drew up the "Lambeth Articles," "which were confirmed by Archbishop Whitgift and others." Baro delivered a sermon opposing these Articles with great logic and clearness. The matter coming to the attention of the authorities, he was ordered by the vice-chancellor to "abstain from all controversy on Articles of Faith." This man held to Arminian doctrines before they were so distinctly advocated, of the same character as held by James Arminius and Simon Episcopius.

JOHN PLAYFERE.

John Playfere, a successor of Baro as Margaret Professor at Cambridge, in 1608 became an Arminian in doctrine, of pronounced views. "He lectured on the subject to his classes, and the spirit of Arminianism spread quite widely." He published a work on the subject, having the title "An Appeal to the Gospel for the True Doctrine of Predestination." Thomas Baker, the antiquary, says that if "Playfere's sermons had never been printed, his name would yet have been honored in

history, so decidedly marked was his influence on the times."

SAMUEL HOARD.

Another eminent collegian was Dr. Samuel Hoard, the rector of Moreton College, who became a strong Arminian, though originally a rank Calvinist. He published a work entitled, "God's Love to Mankind Manifested by Disproving His Absolute Decree for Their Damnation." Rev. John Goodwin was another strong advocate of Arminianism, for which he was ejected from his place and position in 1645.

LAUD AND JUXON.

Two bishops, Laud and Juxon, became Arminians, though they were the advocates of some peculiarities not in the Arminian doctrine, and perhaps did as much harm to the doctrine among the people as they did good. Laud was a singular man, and because of his impetuosity made many bitter enemies. It was about 1617, while in the deanery of Gloucester, that he procured from James I "direction for the better government of the university, which contained the first official disapprobation of the tenets of the Calvinists."

These bishops, especially Laud, went from the field of theology purely into the work of the State, so that, from the time he was made a bishop until the end of his life, he was doing more in the line

of statecraft than of Christian theology. Because of this he is not to be recognized as a safe leader in those matters which require subtle distinctions and careful investigation in order to detect error and bring to light in the clearest manner the truth of God.

FLETCHER'S ACCOUNT OF LAUD.

Fletcher gives a just estimate of Laud and his Arminianism. "Archbishop Laud," says Fletcher, "in the days of King James and Charles I, caused in the gospel scales the turn which then began to take place in our Church in favor of the doctrines of justice. He was the chief instrument which, like Moses' rod, began to part the boisterous sea of Calvinism. He received his light from Arminius, but it was corrupted by a mixture of Pelagian darkness. He aimed rather at putting down absolute reprobation and lawless grace than at chaining up the grace and reconciling the contending parties by recognizing the two Gospel axioms. Hence, passing beyond the Scripture meridian, he led most of the English clergy from one extreme to the other." (Fletcher's Works, Vol. II, pp. 276, 277.)

ENGLAND'S CONDITION AS SEEN BY HALLAM.

Mr. Hallam has gracefully touched the condition of English theological politics at this period. "A far more permanent controversy sprung up about the end of the same reign" (James I), says

Hallam, “ which afforded a pretext for intolerance, and a fresh source of mutual hatred. Every one of my readers is acquainted more or less with the theological tenets of original sin, free will, and predestination, variously taught in the schools and debated by polemical writers for so many centuries; and few can be ignorant that the Articles of our own Church, as they relate to these doctrines, have been very differently interpreted, and that a controversy about their meaning had long been carried on with a pertinacity which could not have continued on so limited a topic had the combatants been merely influenced by the love of truth. Those who have no bias to warp their judgment will not, perhaps, have much hesitation in drawing the line between, though not at an equal distance between, the contending parties. It appears, on the one hand, that the Articles are worded on some of these doctrines with considerable ambiguity, whether we attribute this to the intrinsic obscurity of the subject, to the additional difficulties with which it has been entangled by theological systems, to discrepancy of opinion in the compilers, or to their solicitude to prevent disunion by adopting formularies to which men of different sentiments might subscribe. It is also manifest that their framers came, as it were, with averted eyes to the Augustinian doctrine of predestination, and wisely reprehended those who turned their attention to a system so pregnant with objections, and so dangerous when needlessly dwelt

upon, to all practical piety and virtue. But, on the other hand, the very reluctance to inculcate the tenet is so expressed as to manifest their undoubting belief in it; nor is it possible, either, to assign a motive for inserting the Seventeenth Article, or to give any reasonable interpretation to it upon the present theory which passes for orthodox in the English Church. And upon other subjects intimately related to the former—such as the penalty of original sin, and the depravation of human nature—the Articles, after making every allowance for want of precision, seem totally irreconcilable with the scheme usually denominated Arminian."

AGE OF THEOLOGICAL REVOLT.

This was an age of theological revolt in England. The great leaders, Jewell, Nowell, Sandys, Cox, "professed to concur with the Reformers of Zurich and Geneva." The Zurich letters, published later, evidenced how much Calvin and Bullinger had, by their works, to do with English Calvinism and government-shaping. Their works were text-books in English universities. "Those who did not hold the predestination theory were branded with reproach by the names of Free-willers and Pelagians."

From the time when James I attempted to control the Synod of Dort until long after the Commonwealth, the English mind was dreadfully disturbed concerning Calvinism. It was seething and

bubbling like an angry pot. King and court were alike disturbed. When the Lambeth Articles were formed to teach the strongest Calvinism, and Archbishop Whitgift indorsed them, they were met by Lord Burleigh with disapproval; for his faith in predestination, either Sublapsarian or Supralapsarian had been greatly shaken, and they were not legally sanctioned. As the Greek fathers were read more in England, free will and anti-predestination doctrines were embraced, and the dogmas of Augustine, Gottschalk, Calvin, and Bullinger diminished.

The Episcopal Arminian divines in this century were among the great theologians of England. Such men as these were Arminian in their teaching: Cudworth, Pierce, Jeremy Taylor, Tillotson, Chillingworth, Stillingfleet, Womack, Burnet, Pierson, Sanderson, Heylin, Whitby, Patrick, Tomline, Copleston, Whately, etc. While these eminent divines, one after the other, took up the doctrines of Arminianism, advocating them in their entirety, or in such parts and characters as seemed to demand their attention, they were making a decided impression upon the great mind and heart of the country. The whole of English theology was becoming honeycombed by the doctrines of Arminius. While Calvinism represented one extreme and Arminianism the other, between them were all manner of ideas.

It would not be surprising if, in this discussion

of that period, there would be found many things which could not be tested and found genuine under the light of Arminianism of to-day.

The following is a very clear statement of the theological teaching about the time of the coming of John Wesley: "Arminianism at last, in the Church of England, became a negative term, implying a negation of Calvinism, rather than any exact system of theology whatever. Much that passed for Arminianism was in fact Pelagianism. The history of English theology will show that all who have deviated from the golden mean maintained by Arminius, between Calvinism on the one hand and Pelagianism on the other, have fallen into error as to the Trinity, while those who have adhered to the evangelical doctrine of Arminius have retained all the verity of the orthodox faith. The pure doctrine of Arminianism rose again in England in the great Wesleyan Reformation of the seventeenth century."

CHAPTER VII.

THE POLITICAL HOME OF ARMINIANISM.

Calvinism in the Netherlands—Puritanism—Arminianism—Romanism — Under Philip II of Spain — Causes for Philip's Want of Success — Industries in the Towns of the Netherlands—Towns very Important—Origin and Growth of the Guilds—Philip's Cruelty—Council of Troubles—Alva—William of Orange, the Silent—William was Stadtholder of Holland etc.—The Sea—England — The Tax of Alva repudiated — All Industry ceased—Spanish Soldiers starved—Fury of Alva—How his Inhumanity was Checkmated—“Beggars of the Sea”—Dikes Cut—William Successful—Oath of the People—Louis of Nassau — States Assembly ordered by Alva to meet at The Hague, but they meet William at Dort—A Compact—Elizabeth and her Promise—Coligny slaughtered—Alva afraid of Orange—Orange in Holland—Reviving Hope—The Turning Point of Netherlandish Freedom—Leyden taken by Orange—To Commemorate the Event a University was founded—Many Protestants went to Leyden from Catholic France—William of Orange assassinated—Rejoicing at Rome and Madrid—Protestantism not dead—Puritanism growing—Success of Arminianism—The Political Home of Arminianism an Important Factor in its Permanency and Success.

THE POLITICAL HOME OF ARMINIANISM.

THAT little country on the northwest coast of Europe, which had been rescued from the sea by the hard and persistent labor of the people, was the early home of two great classes of thought, founded

upon a solid basis—Puritanism and Arminianism. These two ideas were by no means the same; but they originated near together, and possessed some things in common. They represent two forms of that internal struggle of the enlightened man, who is conscious of better and higher destinies and privileges than had been accorded him in society as it had existed. Puritanism did not take hold of the great doctrines of religion as found in Christianity, and seek to amplify, teach, and enforce them. Her mission appeared to be the survey of the political aspects of all moral and civil questions, and give direction to the human forces to building up of a country on sound principles of human freedom and right, so that all citizens should be able to enjoy the highest possible civil liberty. Arminianism took hold of and discussed great religious doctrines, those essential to personal salvation, cleared away the mystery and cruelty, the mental and spiritual darkness surrounding the old Calvinistic doctrines of predestination and reprobation. She sought to lift up the despondent heart of sinful men to the spiritual freedom of salvation provided for all men, and received by all on the condition of “repentance towards God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Puritanism was civil in its trend; Arminianism was spiritual in its highest efforts. Both were revolts. Puritanism was a revolt from illegal usurpation, and Arminianism was a revolt from the

dogma binding the mind and heart of mankind under a cruel predestinationism. They originated in their new character in Holland or the Netherlands, and have both found their highest sphere of action in the United States of America.

It will serve our purpose to speak briefly of the geographical and political relations of the early home of Arminianism. The country on the north-west coast of Europe was called, sometimes, the Low Countries, because so much of it lay below the sea-level, and whose waters were kept out by immense dikes or levees, against which the breakers surged and roared, wasting their fury on walls reared by brave hearts and hands; sometimes called Netherlands, or Northlands, because of their relation to France and Normandy; sometimes called Holland, or Hollowland, the largest State in the confederacy. The territory was small, being only about half the size of England, when the whole seventeen are considered. Ten of these little States, those on the south and now forming Belgium, were Catholic, and were ruled by a foreign Catholic prince. The seven lying to the north revolted from Catholicism, and were Protestant. The foreign Roman Catholic power sought to seize and hold these seven provinces, and convert them to the religion and service of Rome. But they had in-born a spirit of independence, both in the power to govern and the power to think, and refused obedience to a foreign power. These men of ster-

ling worth, independence of spirit, and nobility of character, united and formed the "Dutch Republic," known as the "United Netherlands." It had only about 13,000 square miles of territory, water and land, and to possess this from the restless North Sea required a continuous fight. It had no natural boundaries on the south and east, by which an invading foe might be kept out. Yet it carried on a war for eighty years against the cruel Roman foe, who sought the entire destruction of the Republic. These seven States were only one-fourth as large as England. "Little, historic Greece was half as large again." She was one-twentieth as large as France, a Roman Catholic country, and, when compared with Europe, was but one three-hundredths of the whole. This little spot of country, filled with sturdy and determined people, bravely, fearlessly, and continually withstood the encroachments of foes by sea and land. In this country was the new birth of Puritanism and Arminianism. Full attention to Puritanism will reveal why and how she lived, and why Arminianism found a good soil in which to grow.

At the time of the revolt of Puritanism in the Netherlands, the seventeen States were under the domination of Philip II of Spain, a prince of absolute superstition, and of a cruelty of nature not to be excelled even by the cruel and blind old Torquemada. The old emperor, the Castilian Charles V, had become sick and morose. The pains of the

gout were so excruciating that they greatly added to the weariness of ruling. He abdicated the throne, and placed upon it his son, Philip II. Charles V had never given himself much concern about the conduct of these States of the north. Each State had “an hereditary ruler, called a duke, marquis, count, or baron.” The overlord, Philip II, appointed “governors or stadholders, to represent his sovereignty in the various provinces, and a regent to govern the whole.” In these States were about 3,000,000 people. They were an industrious people, which made them unusually prosperous. They studied much, and became very intelligent. While Charles V lived and ruled, the people had but little of which they complained; but when Philip came into power, they at once realized the will and cruelty of the new ruler.

Why did Philip II never succeed in ruling the Netherlands? Mr. Campbell, in his excellent book, “The Puritan in Holland, England, and America,” gives the reason: “That successor [of Charles V—Philip II] never understood the people committed to his rule, knew nothing of their spirit, and could not comprehend why they so insisted on their civil and religious rights. Throughout the rest of Europe, the feudal tyranny having passed away, the monarchs were absorbing all the power. Such was the case in neighboring France, in Spain, where Philip was born and reared, and in England, where he found a wife. Why should he not govern these

provinces in the same manner as the other parts of his dominions? That he could not, he discovered before his death." (Vol. I, p. 137.)

The situation of the Netherlands was such that the greater part of their industry must be carried on in town. Even the agricultural enterprises contributed to the business carried forward in the towns. Since the millions of people could not find ample scope for their energies in the soil, they naturally developed manufacturing. The country became dotted with walled towns. In a little while they became strong enough for defense against foreign foes. This gave the people a taste for liberty and independency. Already a quasi-Puritanism was showing itself. It could be but a little way before Puritanism will be full-fledged.

There grew up almost insensibly the guilds—some for mutual protection, some for trades, and some for social interests. While it is doubtful if any political complexion was given them at the outset, in the Netherlands they soon "assumed the government of towns." The name of earlier times gave place to another, expressing the idea of "commune." About the guilds was a semi-religious atmosphere; for, on admission to membership, the candidate "took an oath to uphold divine worship, and to serve his count legally and with all his might." Once in the guild, there was a wonderful equality among the members. There was a real democracy. When the time came to assume polit-

ical relations and duties, it was but natural for workmen to carry their ideas of equality and religion into their citizen responsibilities.

Many cities came to be of so much consequence as to obtain a charter, and with the charter certain extraordinary rights and privileges of a social, religious, and political character. They greatly increased their means of defense. They became practically impregnable. They molested no one, and were not willing that any should molest them. The smaller towns contiguous to the larger cities, naturally placed themselves under the protection of these fastnesses. In turn, the smaller towns lent their aid to the enriching of the cities in return for this protection. A common interest led all the chartered cities and their dependent towns to a mutual interchange of sentiment, so that, for the protection of all, they were united. They made a common cause. It was against their freedom-loving, liberty-enjoying, wealth-obtaining, and worship-observing people that Philip II hurled his forces, to be met by a sad but certain defeat.

When Philip II came to attempt to exercise his power in the Netherlands in cruelty, that people, so unused to such things, mildly protested. Then the Inquisition and Margaret of Parma were sent to quell the rising tide of insubordination. Margaret found a power too great to meet and overthrow. There were uprisings in various quarters. Then Alva, the duke, as cruel a Spaniard, as unscrupu-

lous a Catholic, and as superstitious a Romanist as ever lived, was sent to take command, with ten thousand picked men of the Spanish army. He entered the Netherlands, organized the "Council of Troubles," which, by its inhuman practices, soon came to be called the "Council of Blood." The story of the bloody scenes of this period is horrible in the extreme. The very rivers were flooded with human blood, and the very lakes and inlets were colored with gore. The wails of anguish that went up from this country were enough to move a heart of stone.

"Man's inhumanity to man
Made countless thousands mourn."

Alva commenced his inhuman butchery in August, 1567.

Reared at the court of Charles V was William of Orange, the man of destiny, who was ultimately to deliver his people. It was upon the arm of William of Orange that Charles V leaned when he performed "the magnificent ceremony of his abdication." While at the Court of St. Cloud, William developed a quality which gave him the name of "Silent." It was when the King of France revealed to him his league with Philip of Spain to crush out heresy everywhere in his kingdoms. Silently he listened. Great thoughts filled his mind, and great purposes filled his brave heart. He resolved to thwart the purpose of Philip II regarding his own loved native Netherlands.

Philip appointed William of Orange Stadholder of Holland, Zealand, and Utrecht. It was a long way and a rough way before William could lay the foundation of the Dutch Republic. Caution, coupled with steadiness of purpose, ever kept him from any rash acts that would lead to a thwarting of his great purpose. He, of all others, understood what was meant by the coming of Alva. He went into voluntary exile. Protestants began to rally to his aid. In 1568 he hoped the time had arrived for decisive and successful action. So he hurled his few troops against Alva, and failed. Orange fled to France, and joined the Huguenots. He was the warm friend of Coligny.

The sea was destined to be the stronghold and fast friend of the Netherlanders. Privateers, bearing the commission of the Prince of Condé, preyed upon some rich Spanish merchantmen. Some of these merchant vessels fled for safety into English ports, and Elizabeth seized the vessels, and converted the money to her use. Alva was furious. Elizabeth promised restoration, but it was never made. He appealed to Philip, in Spain. Delay followed delay, until four years had passed before anything came of it. Matters continued to go on in the Netherlands in a fierce persecution. The people were roused. They were ready for any revolt. In Spain, gold was becoming scarce, and the stream of supplies failed to flow to Alva, and great discontent arose among his Spanish troops. In his

vexation and distress, Alva proposed to tax directly all the land of the Netherlands one per cent per annum, and one-tenth of the selling price of the sales of personal property. He submitted this proposition to the States Assemblies in 1569, but they received it with indignation. Alva would not modify his demand. At last, Utrecht alone refused to accede to his demands, and her people were subjected to a heavy fine. The leaven was working. The Protestant indignation was deepening in the Netherlands. The time would soon be ripe for another blow to be struck in a revolt that should shiver Alva and the Spanish hopes forever, so far as Holland was concerned.

The heroic Netherlanders, repudiating the tax of Alva, suspended business. All industry came to a stop. Bread, meat, and beer could not be found. The people husbanded the little reserve they had, but the Spanish soldiers were hungry. Money would not purchase food. The wheels of industry had all suddenly ceased to hum. Starvation was before the army. To say that Alva was angry is to speak mildly of his mental state. He was furious. One April night, in 1572, he ordered the court executioners to seize eighteen of Brussels's most respected tradesmen, and hang them, each before his own door, and see if this vengeance would not start trade again. That order was never executed. That night, while Alva least expected it, by the good providence of God, the "Beggars of the Sea," with

a fleet of twenty-four ships, fell upon the coast. William de la Marck, "a bloodthirsty, savage, lawless, and licentious ruffian," commanded. He struck at Brill. He easily obtained possession of this walled town. His great thought was to plunder the town; but William de Blois, whose brother Alva had murdered, proposed to give this place over to William of Orange. This advice was heeded. The word of this success fell upon Alva's ears as ominous. He ceased the executions, and ordered soldiers to Brill. Ten companies marched from Utrecht. The sturdy Brilians, having had a taste of success, were thoroughly aroused. They cut the dikes, flooded the country and the city, and burned a few transports to keep them from falling into the hands of the Spaniards. Defeated, the soldiers of Alva retired. The people took an oath to support William of Orange. This prince was arranging to make an assault on the Spanish at another point, but his plans were not complete.

Louis of Nassau, a younger brother of Orange, was a brave patriot, and, next to Coligny, the idol of the Huguenots. With a small force, he had fallen upon Mons, in Hainault, the southern State of the Netherlands, and had captured it. He was an ardent, outspoken Christian and Protestant. This occurred in May, 1572. Alva, pushed by his losses, called to the States Assembly of Holland to meet at The Hague. They met, not at The Hague and with Alva, but at Dort with William of

Orange. A compact was entered into between the Assembly of Holland and William, and troops were raised at once, to be paid by the cities. On the 27th of August, 1572, William, at the head of 24,000 men, began his march toward Mons, to deliver his brother Louis. Everywhere William was received by the cities and people with great demonstrations of joy. Men came to his standard. All was prosperous, and soon, it was hoped, the hated Spaniard would be conquered, and swept from the States of the Netherlands. Just in this blaze of excitement, the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day occurred in France. Coligny, the bosom friend of William, fell by an assassin's hand. The army William hoped to have come to his standard from France, now could not be obtained. Elizabeth of England had promised aid to the Hollanders, but she began to dally with Philip and Alva, hoping to gain some benefit for her kingdom in the coming crash.

Alva feared to meet Orange in the field. Mons gave up to the Spanish troops. France and England both deserted him. Just as he seemed in the moment of greatest success, the blight of darkness fell upon him, and hope died. What could he do? His army was disbanded, and Orange went almost alone into Holland, where he might wait, as God willed, with becoming endurance and patience. Orange believed himself the man of destiny. He believed that God designed religious and civil free-

dom for him and his people, and he was the man to secure them. The Christian Romanist was now a Christian Protestant. Toleration, religious liberty, civil freedom, were terms he loved to dwell upon, for they were words consistent with the eternal truth and word of God.

The story of reviving hope, of the defense of the cities and homes of Holland, the maintaining of a siege for seven months against the combined forces of Spain, the cutting of the dikes and flooding of the country, the strength and courage of William, the power of endurance of himself and people, the butchery at Haarlem by the Spanish, after they surrendered on terms of promised protection, the heroism of men and women who fought and suffered to the last, the recall of Alva, the coming of Don Louis de Requesens, Grand Commander of Castile, and the tide of victory at Middleburg, as well as on the sea, are scenes and incidents vividly drawn by the historian, and evidence how much of faith, bravery, and courage were required to gain religious freedom. The date at which may be set the turning point for Netherlandish freedom was February, 1574.

Leyden was soon after attacked by Orange, and, after a brilliant siege, was taken. Twice the Spanish forces attempted to retake Leyden; but Orange finally, by the flood, rescued the city, and defeated the hated Spanish. Here Puritanism found, thirty years later, her strongest hold and warmest friends.

Somehow Leyden became strongly connected with the “cause of religion and learning.”

To commemorate this glorious delivery from Spanish rule, Orange and the Estates founded the University of Leyden. Learning, religion, and liberty—here they found a home and a center from which to radiate. The University of Leyden was destined to be a tremendous power for building up and maintaining Dutch liberty and Protestant Christianity. Great names have been connected with the University of Leyden. John Van Der Does, the first curator; Justus Lipsius, of the chair of History; John Drusus, the Orientalist; Gomarus, and Arminius, the great theologians; G. J. Vossius, the celebrated grammarian; Peter Paaw, the botanist; Hemsterhuys, the scientific student of Greek; Boerhaave, Albinus, and many others, eminent in their several departments,—were great lights at Leyden.

From Catholic France Leyden drew much of the Protestant element. She had within herself men by the thousands to be led along the blessed pathway into the highest realms of learning. By this school she was destined to wield an influence for two hundred years in the Dutch Republic, that should be the pride of the world.

William of Orange took a prominent place in Dutch liberty. He was foremost in all the plans for her advancement. He could not be corrupted by Spanish gold, or promises of the greatest things

in Spanish gift. A price was set upon his head. Assassins were encouraged to kill him. The attempt was made in 1582, but failed. The terrible deed was accomplished, July 10, 1584, by a bullet sped by Balthasar Gerard. While Rome and Madrid, the pope and Philip rejoiced, and sang the *Te Deum*, as on the occasion of the base assassinations of St. Bartholomew's Day in France, the man of God, the silent hero, died praying, "God have mercy on my poor people." The world lost a man, Holland a brave defender, liberty an heroic champion, and Christianity a strong support.

Puritanism did not die with William of Orange, as many antagonists hoped. It lived. It realized the foe it had still to meet and vanquish. It saw the need of a strong arm on which to lean, a determining mind, quick to discern, and ready to plan for victory, a sharp and active understanding, to detect the dissimulation of the basest of foes, as unscrupulous as Satan, and a courage that would not quail when facing the vilest of men, and uplift humanity, and disenthral the evil. Where should such a one be found?

Puritanism became strong in the Netherlands. Protestantism grew rank by her side. Puritanism and Protestantism were not synonymous, nor could they be used interchangeably, but they grew so near together that they seemed to have common interests and a common destiny. Determined men offered life, fortune, ease, and family for the suc-

cess of Puritanism and Protestantism. The resources of this goodly land lay at the feet of these two great and essential elements to the grand success of religious and civil liberty.

The home of Arminianism was within the wonderful Netherlands. It had interests in common with Puritanism. It was an essential element of Protestantism. It sought to have and enjoy civil and religious liberty. In Amsterdam and Leyden, even in the great Memorial University of William of Orange, within nineteen years from the assassination of the Silent Man, it was born—born to a sturdy life, to a period of trouble, but to vigorous thought and an ultimate triumph.

The Arminians, while denying predestination, “proclaimed a practical theory, which was more important” to the people than any gone before in the struggle to found a republic. “They claimed that in religious matters the State was supreme, that it should appoint the ministers, and that it alone should have the regulation of Church discipline and dogma. This was the doctrine which in the end brought King James and the whole High Church party of England into the ranks of Arminianism, although they fought its theology for many years. It was utterly repudiated by the Anabaptists, who believed in the separation of Church and State.” (The Puritan, etc., Vol. II, p. 302.)

“In 1606, three years after Arminius had begun his teaching, the new principles had gained

such headway that the clerical party called for a National Synod to settle the religious dissensions. At this time, it must be borne in mind, Barneveldt was supreme in the States General. The municipal Councils, which lay at the foundations of the Government, were mostly in favor of the Arminians, who supported their ecclesiastical pretensions, and believed in giving them more power. Above the municipal Councils stood the Assemblies of the Provinces, imbued with the same ideas. These were the bodies which then controlled the situation. Under such conditions Barneveldt declared openly in favor of a National Synod, thus fully recognizing the principle that the Netherlands were a nation, with full power to regulate all its affairs, despite any parchment treaties of the past."

Thus is traced the political home of Arminianism. It became an important factor in the complete development of the Dutch Republic. It even stood by the great principles of nationality. It was the strong ally of education, the highest culture, the best kind of civil liberty, and perfect toleration. It enriched literature. It studied and unfolded science. It entered the field of speculative and constitutional law. It reveled in the glories of philosophy. It glorified theology, and advocated the religion of the heart.

God had a mission for Arminianism. He proposed that it should be carried out.

CHAPTER VIII.

ARMINIANISM IN ITS WESLEYAN GROWTH.

Wesleyanism a Reformation—Samuel Wesley's Revolt from Calvinism—When John Wesley embraced Arminianism—Sermon on God's Free Grace—Gropings for Freedom from Predestination in a Letter to his Mother—Her Reply—Mr. Wesley's Letter from Wroote—Sermon—His Eight Reasons for antagonizing Predestination—Dialogue of 1741—His Work on “The Scripture Doctrine Concerning Predestination”—Four Reasons for objecting to Absolute Predestination—Mr. Wesley in the Clear Light of God's Love—His Delight to preach Arminianism—The Arminian Magazine—Why established—Why called “Arminian”—Character of the Magazine—The First Article on James Arminius—Separation between John Wesley and George Whitefield—Cause—Whitefield Calvinistic—Worked together in the Kingswood School—Growing Differences—Whitefield an Evangelist—Wesley an Organizer—Whitefield became an Ardent Calvinist by Contact with New England Calvinists—Whitefield's Letter to Wesley—Reply—Whitefield's Letter to Wesley from Cape Lopen—Calvinism in America of a Strong Type—Letter from Boston on “Sinless Perfection”—Calvinistic Controversy—Howell Harris and his Letters to Wesley on Calvinism—Wesley's Replies—Countess of Huntingdon—The Whitefieldians as Methodists were Calvinistic—Whitefield would not unite with Wesley—Whitefield's Death—Wesley's Consistent Movements—Arminianism Triumphant.

THE ministers and members of the Scottish Church of the middle of the last century hated the Arminians as much as they did sin and Satan. In

their enumeration of errors, Arminianism was classed along with others considered as the worst. "Do you disown all Popish, Arian, Socinian, Arminian, Bourignon, and other doctrines and tenets and opinions whatever, contrary to and inconsistent with the Confession of Faith?" asked they.

The Nonjuring Presbyterians were for years called the "Nons." To their creed was added the following sharply antagonistic addenda: "I leave my protest," says a stern Cameronian, "against all sectarian errors, heresies, and blasphemies, particularly against Arianism, Erastianism, Socinianism, Quakerism, Deism, Bourignonism, Familism, Scepticism, Arminianism, Lutheranism, Pelagianism, Campbellism, Whitefieldianism, Latitudinarianism, and Independency, and all other sects and sorts that maintain any error, heresy, or blasphemy that is contrary to the Word of God, and all erroneous speeches vented from pulpits, pages, or in public or private discourses; and against all toleration granted or given, at any time, in favor of these or any other errors, heresies or blasphemies, or blasphemous heretics, particularly the toleration granted by the sectarian usurper, Oliver Cromwell, the Antichristian toleration granted by the popish Duke of York, and the present continued toleration granted by that wicked Jezebel, the pretended Queen, Anne." (From Burton, IX, 60, as quoted by Stanley in his Lectures on the Church of Scotland, p. 66.)

Wesleyan Arminianism was a reformation, and was directly antagonistic to all that had been taught in the previous years of predestination according to the Genevan theory. Mr. Wesley's father, though to what extent may not be known, had broken away from the rigid doctrines of the earlier times. It will be a matter of pleasure and profit to follow the mind of Mr. Wesley as he was breaking away from the shackles of the old theology, and found in the interpretation of Scripture satisfaction to his own mind and heart that Jesus Christ had made a sufficient atonement for every ruined son of Adam who would come with repentance and faith, and seek the pardon of a reconciled God.

Mr. Wesley came into the full acknowledgment of Arminianism at an early period in his ministry; for why should he have crossed the ocean to preach the gospel to Indians and those who were destitute of religion on this continent if he had not felt it possible for those who heard his preaching to turn and live? When he was first an Arminian is a question of interest. In his first sermon, in 1738, preached at Oxford soon after his conversion, on "By grace are ye saved through faith," and in the same year a sermon on "God's Free Grace," he taught that "the grace or love of God, whence cometh our salvation, is free in all, and free for all."

Mr. Wesley's first gropings after freedom from predestination are found in a letter to his mother, of June 18, 1725, in which he speaks of reading

Thomas á Kempis and Dr. Taylor's "Holy Living and Dying." "If we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us—which we will not do unless we are regenerate—certainly we must be sensible of it. If we can never have any certainty of being in a state of salvation, good reason it is that every moment should be spent, not in joy, but in fear and trembling; and then undoubtedly, in this life, we are of all men the most miserable. God deliver us from such a fearful expectation as this!" (Tyerman's Life of Wesley, Vol. I, p. 35.) Here Wesley was feeling after "God's love to all and the privilege of living in a state of conscious salvation." His mother wrote, July 21, 1725, a letter touching upon this subject, to which he replied, July 29, 1725: "What shall I say of predestination? An everlasting purpose of God to deliver some from damnation does, I suppose, exclude all from that deliverance who are not chosen. And if it was inevitably decreed from eternity that such a determinate part of mankind should be saved, and none besides them, a vast majority of the world were only born to eternal death, without so much as a possibility of avoiding it. How is this consistent with either the Divine justice or mercy? Is it merciful to ordain a creature to everlasting misery? Is it just to punish man for crimes which he could not but commit? That God should be the author of sin and injustice (which must, I think; be the consequences of maintaining this opinion),

is a contradiction to the clearest ideas we have of the Divine nature and perfections." (Tyerman, Vol. I, p. 39.)

Mr. Wesley was coming out of his intellectual conflict into a full view of the weakness of predestination. While his views on faith were not up to the Arminian view, still he was approaching it. His mother was a superior counselor. One of her greatest letters, and one whose doctrine regarding predestination he fully indorsed, was written from Wroote, August 18, 1725. In it she says: "I have often wondered that men should be so vain as to amuse themselves with searching into the decrees of God, which no human wit can fathom, and do not rather employ their time and powers in working out their salvation. Such studies tend more to confound than to inform the understanding, and young people had better let them alone. But since I find you have some scruples concerning our article 'Of Predestination,' I will tell you my thoughts of the matter. . . . The doctrine of predestination as maintained by the rigid Calvinists is very shocking, and ought to be abhorred, because it directly charges the Most High God with being the author of sin. I think you reason well and justly against it; for it is certainly inconsistent with the justice and goodness of God to lay any man under either a physical or moral necessity of committing sin, and then to punish him for doing it." (Tyerman, Vol. I, p. 40.)

There were prejudices for him to overcome, questions arising from early education to be carefully and justly answered, and a new life to be felt in his own heart before he could be said to be disenthralled and breathe the spirit of a really free man. But God, by the Holy Spirit, was leading him on step by step, over a rough road to the place of certainty and satisfaction.

In 1740, Mr. Wesley delivered a sermon on "Free Grace," using for a text, Romans viii, 32, which was printed, having annexed Charles Wesley's "Hymn on Universal Redemption." In this sermon he sharply defines predestination as the Calvinists insisted on defining it. "Free grace in all," he said, "is not free grace for all, but only for those whom God hath ordained to life. The greater part of mankind God hath ordained to death, and it is not free for them. Them God hateth, and therefore, before they were born, decreed that they should die eternally. And this he absolutely decreed, because it was his sovereign will. Accordingly they are born for this, to be destroyed body and soul in hell. And they grow up under the irrevocable curse of God, without any possibility of redemption; for what grace God gives, he gives only for this, to increase, not prevent their damnation."

Mr. Wesley then states his reasons for antagonizing the doctrine of predestination:

"1. It renders all preaching vain; for preach-

ing is needless to them that are elected; for they, whether with it or without it, will infallibly be saved. And it is useless to them that are not elected; for they, whether with preaching or without it, will infallibly be damned.

“2. It directly tends to destroy that holiness which is the end of all the ordinances of God; for it wholly takes away those first motives to follow after holiness, so frequently proposed in Scripture, the hope of future reward and fear of punishment, the hope of heaven and fear of hell.

“3. It directly tends to destroy several particular branches of holiness; for it naturally tends to inspire or increase a sharpness of temper, which is quite contrary to the meekness of Christ, and leads a man to treat with contempt or coldness those whom he supposes to be outcasts from God.

“4. It tends to destroy the comfort of religion.

“5. It directly tends to destroy our zeal for good works; for what avails it to relieve the wants of those who are just dropping into eternal fire?

“6. It is a direct and manifest tendency to overthrow the whole Christian revelation; for it makes it unnecessary.

“7. It makes the Christian revelation contradict itself; for it is grounded on such an interpretation of some texts as flatly contradicts all the other texts, and indeed the whole scope and tenor of Scripture.

“8. It is full of blasphemy; for it represents

our blessed Lord as a hypocrite and dissembler, in saying one thing and meaning another, in pretending a love which he had not; it also represents the most holy God as more false, more cruel, and more unjust than the devil; for, in point of fact, it says that God has condemned millions of souls to everlasting fire for continuing in sin, which, for want of the grace he gives them not, they are unable to avoid." (Tyerman, Vol. I, p. 319.)

From this time on Mr. Wesley does not seem to have any trouble or question as to the nature and character of Calvinism. He preached against it. He warned his followers against its seductive wiles, and led many out of the slough of despond to perfect rest and peace. His utterances grew strong against predestination. In 1741 he published "A Dialogue between a Predestinarian and his Friend," in which he showed, "from the writings of Piscator, Calvin, Zanchius, and others, that predestinarianism teaches that God causes reprobates to sin, and creates them on purpose to be damned." (Tyerman, Vol. I, p. 366.)

In 1741, Mr. Wesley published two small works on predestination—"The Scripture Doctrine Concerning Predestination, Election, and Reprobation," and "Serious Considerations on Absolute Predestination." In this last he gave four reasons why he objected to the doctrine of absolute predestination:

"1. Because it makes God the author of sin.

"2. Because it makes Him delight in the death of sinners.

"3. Because it is highly injurious to Christ, our Mediator.

"4. Because it makes the preaching of the gospel a mere mockery and illusion."

John Wesley was now out in the clear light of God's love to all sinners, and fully appreciated the mission of Christ to fulfill the will of the Father with regard to providing a plan whereby all men may be placed in a salvable state, and by the exercise of the will may, "by repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ," be brought into a personal relation with God as actually pardoned and accepted, and receive the assurance that God is reconciled. These words, as expressive of the greatest doctrines of a pure and true religion, were often presented and elucidated by Mr. Wesley, namely: Justification by faith only, repentance, free will, Divine grace, pardon, assurance, reconciled, salvation free for all. From this time forward it was a source of unbounded delight to preach to sinners, high or low, a free and full salvation from all sin, and declare that in the "freedom of the will" lies man's dignity and manhood. To all classes, high and cultured, low and ignorant, the respectable sinners and the vilest outcasts, he preached a Christ for them. While in a state of probation they were permitted to come to Christ, and enter the fold and be

saved. Thousands of sinners, hearing this great doctrine of Christ as preached by Wesley and his preachers, which was true Arminianism, bowed before the Savior in repentance, and by faith received him into the heart, and arose new creatures. The preaching of Christ after the Arminian doctrine brought to England the greatest and most thorough revival it ever knew.

THE ARMINIAN MAGAZINE.

Mr. Wesley, after long and critical study and the constant preaching of Arminianism, determined to establish a magazine which should regularly appear as an auxiliary to him in fulfilling his mission to men. To this magazine he gave the name of "Arminian," in honor of that great divine of Holland, James Arminius. According to Tyerman's life, Vol. III, August 14, 1777, Mr. Wesley drew up his proposal "for a magazine to be issued for the benefit of the Methodists." The heading is unique; namely, "*The Arminian Magazine: Consisting of Extracts and Original Treatises on Universal Redemption.*"

In the first and second paragraphs he sets forth what had been published in the *Christian Magazine*, in the *Spiritual Magazine*, and the *Gospel Magazine*, that Christ did not die for all, but for one in ten, for the elect only. He then says: "This comfortable doctrine, the sum of which, proposed in plain English, is, God before the foundation of

the world absolutely and irrevocably decreed that ‘some men shall be saved, do what they will, and the rest be damned, do what they can,’ has by these tracts been distributed throughout the land with the utmost diligence. And these champions of it have, from the beginning, proceeded in a manner worthy of their cause. They have paid no more regard to good nature, decency, or good manners, than to reason or truth. All these they set utterly at defiance. Without any deviations from their plan, they have defended their dear decrees with arguments worthy of Bedlam, and with language worthy of Billingsgate.”

In his third paragraph he gives the character of his proposed magazine. “In the Arminian Magazine a very different opinion will be defended in a very different manner. We maintain that God willeth all men to be saved, by speaking the truth in love, by arguments and illustrations drawn partly from the Scripture, partly from reason; proposed in as inoffensive a manner as the nature of the thing will permit. Not that we expect those on the other side of the question will use us as we use them. Yet we hope nothing will move us to return evil for evil, or, however provoked, to render railing for railing.”

In paragraph 5 he tells us what shall be the first article in the magazine. “We know nothing more proper to introduce a work of this kind than a sketch of the life and death of Arminius, a per-

son with whom those who mention his name with the utmost indignity are commonly quite unacquainted, of whom they know no more than Hermes Trismegistus." (Tyerman's Life of Wesley, Vol. III, pp. 281, 282.)

SEPARATION BETWEEN JOHN WESLEY AND GEORGE WHITEFIELD.

What was the cause of the separation between these two great lights in Methodism, John Wesley and George Whitefield? When did it occur? These two master minds were members of the Holy Club at Oxford, often met as the years went by, seemed to maintain the warmest attachment for years, preached in the same open fields and to the same crowds, rejoiced together in the conversion of the same souls, but after a time separated and walked different paths, and sought to build up different denominations. In 1739, when at London, the property designed for the use of the society of Methodists was purchased, it was deeded to trustees. Debts occurred by the mismanagement of the trustees, and the burden fell on Mr. Wesley. Mr. Whitefield refused to aid in the liquidation of the debt so long as the title was in trustees; but if Mr. Wesley held the title, he and others would seek to obtain the funds to pay the debt and complete the chapel. Mr. Whitefield said if the deed remains in the trustees, unless Mr. Wesley preaches to suit them they may at any moment, and for any pre-

tense, shut up the building and bar out Mr. Wesley. After a full and free discussion of the subject the trustees conveyed the title to Mr. Wesley, who held it until, by his famous "Deed of Declaration," he conveyed all his interests in the church property to the Legal Hundred, who constitute the "Methodist Wesleyan Conference."

At this time there was the most perfect harmony existing between Wesley and Whitefield. They had labored together in the founding of the Kingswood School. They had collected and given money to carry it forward. Together they had labored for the salvation of the wicked Kingswood colliers, and to all appearances their hearts were knit together like those of David and Jonathan.

There were already marked differences between these two men. Mr. Wesley was the logician and great organizer. His gigantic mind and warm heart reached out to all men, and discovered forces latent, but ready to be brought into active exercise. He readily discovered how men might be organized to accomplish the will of God. He was a fair orator, but always a clear, sound thinker. Mr. Whitefield was an impulsive man, a splendid orator, as full of passion and feeling as a human heart could be. He had a splendid voice, and could speak to thousands as well as to hundreds. His oratory was the greatest of the world. He played with human emotions as readily as a child will play with its mother's apron-strings. He was neither a logi-

cian nor organizer. He possessed a vivid imagination, and could plan for the millions, but he could not execute.

"Up to the time of Whitefield's visit to America," says Tyerman, "he and the Wesleys had labored in union and harmony without entering into the discussion of particular opinions; but now, across the Atlantic, Whitefield became acquainted with a number of godly Calvinist ministers, who recommended to him the writings of the Puritan divines, which he read with great avidity, and, as a consequence, soon embraced their sentiments." (Tyerman, Vol. I, p. 312.)

Mr. Whitefield was of such a disposition that he must communicate to Mr. Wesley the change that had occurred in his mind. His letter of July 2, 1739, from Gloucester to Mr. Wesley, has a plaint of sorrow because Mr. Wesley does not hold and advocate predestination. "Dear, honored Sir," writes Whitefield, "if you have any regard for the peace of the Church, keep in your sermon on Predestination. But you have cast a lot." With this letter Whitefield evidenced how fully his heart was set on rescuing Mr. Wesley from the error of Arminianism, as he thought it to be. "O, my heart," writes he, "in the midst of my body, is like melted wax."

To this Mr. Wesley wrote, firmly opposing the doctrine of election, and setting forth the privilege of Christians to know that they are saved "en-

tirely from sin in its proper sense, and from committing it."

Mr. Whitefield soon went to America the second time. He carried his ardent desire for the integrity of Calvinism with him, and advocated it almost continuously. Whitefield addressed a letter to Wesley from Savannah, Ga., March 26, 1740. In it he said: "For once hearken to a child, who is willing to wash your feet. . . . If possible, I am ten thousand times more convinced of the doctrine of election and the final perseverance of those that are truly in Christ, than when I saw you last. You think otherwise. Why, then, should we dispute, when there is no probability of convincing?" Whitefield knew enough of Mr. Wesley and his firmness when convinced of the right to know how improbable it was that he would be able to convince Mr. Wesley, and change his belief. But, May 24, 1740, Mr. Whitefield wrote again to Mr. Wesley, dating his letter from Cape Lopen: "Honored Sir," he wrote, "I can not entertain prejudices against your conduct and principles any longer without imploring you. The more I examine the writings of the most experienced men, and the experience of the most established Christians, the more I differ from your notion about not committing sin, and your denying the doctrines of election and final perseverance of the saints. I dread coming to England, unless you are resolved to oppose these truths with less warmth than when I was there

last. . . . God himself teaches, my friend, the doctrine of election. . . . Perhaps I may never see you again till we meet in judgment; then, if not before, you will know that sovereign, distinguishing, irresistible grace brought you to heaven. Then will you know that God loved you with an everlasting love." (Tyerman, Vol. I, p. 314.)

Whitefield revealed an historic fact in his letters to Wesley, that in America at that time there was only known and preached the hardest and harshest kind of Calvinism. The preaching of Cotton Mather, Increase Mather, the Edwardses, and others, had saturated the American mind with Calvinism the entire length of the Atlantic coast, and settled the people into the habit of an unrighteous intolerance.

Not content with sending epistles to Mr. Wesley, Whitefield wrote to others to prejudice them against his former warm friend and well-wisher. To Mr. James Hutton he writes: "For Christ's sake, desire dear Brother Wesley to avoid disputing with me. I think I had rather die than see a division between us; and yet how can we walk together if we oppose each other?" (Tyerman, Vol. I, p. 315.) On the 25th of June, 1740, Whitefield wrote from Savannah, Georgia, to Wesley, using this language: "For Christ's sake, if possible, never speak against election in your sermons." In all of Mr. Whitefield's letters there was not offered a single argument

to substantiate the doctrine of election or reprobation. His were mere assertions, and declarations of sorrow that Mr. Wesley did not believe as he. But, so far as can be discovered, this noble English Arminian did not reply until August 9, 1740, when he wrote to Mr. Whitefield: "My Dear Brother,— I thank you for yours of May 24th. The case is quite plain. There are bigots both for predestination and against it. God is sending a message to these on either side. But neither will receive it, unless from one who is of their own opinion. Therefore, for a time, you are suffered to be of one opinion, and I of another. But when His time is come, God will do what man can not; namely, make us of one mind. Then persecution will flame out, and it will be seen whether we count our lives dear unto ourselves, so that we may finish our course with joy." (Tyerman, Vol. I, p. 316.)

Two letters came to Mr. Wesley, one from Charlestown, South Carolina, August 25, 1740, in which Mr. Whitefield modified somewhat his ardor against Mr. Wesley, and admits that "perhaps the doctrines of election and of final perseverance have been abused; but, notwithstanding, they are children's bread, and ought not to be withheld from them, supposing they are always mentioned with proper cautions against the abuse of them." (Tyerman, Vol. I, p. 316.)

The second letter was dated Boston, September 25, 1740. After criticising Mr. Wesley as to "sin-

less perfection," concerning which Mr. Whitefield had distorted notions, he says: "Besides, dear Sir, what a fond conceit it is to cry up perfection, and to cry down the doctrine of final perseverance! But this and many other absurdities you will run into, because you will not own election, because you can not own it without believing the doctrine of reprobation. What, then, is there in reprobation so horrid? I see no blasphemy in holding that doctrine, if rightly explained. If God might have passed by all, he may pass by some. Judge whether it is not a greater blasphemy to say, 'Christ died for souls now in hell.'" (Tyerman, Vol. I, p. 317.)

The Calvinistic controversy grew with the years, and caused many heart-burnings. In Wales the work of the Methodist societies went on under the direction of Rev. Howell Harris, a man of great power and unusual spirituality. When the controversy came on, he took the side of Calvinism, and opposed Mr. Wesley and his Arminian views. His letters to Mr. Wesley were of a very severe character, and, when read in the light of history, evince a mistaken man. In his letter of July 16, 1740, to Mr. Wesley, he says: "I hope I shall contend, with my last breath and blood, that it is owing to special, distinguishing, and irresistible grace that those that are saved, are saved. O that you would not touch on this subject till God enlighten you! My dear brother, being a public person, you grieve God's people by your opposition to electing love; and

many poor souls believe your doctrine simply because you hold it. All this arises from the prejudices of your education, your books, your companions, and the remains of your carnal reason. The more I write, the more I love you. I am sure you are one of God's elect, and that you act honestly according to the light you have." (Tyerman, Vol. I, p. 315.)

Mr. Wesley desired to retain Mr. Harris, but his course was such as to render this impossible. January 5 and 6, 1743, he gathered the societies of Wales into a sort of compact on the Calvinistic basis, Whitefield and other clergymen being present, and after the death of Countess Huntingdon, in 1791, they became the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists.

The Countess of Huntingdon was a very religious woman, who admired the earnest preaching of Mr. Wesley and Mr. Whitefield. Mr. Wesley was of too independent a turn of mind to be led by her, but Mr. Whitefield was taken "under her special patronage." When, on his return from America, he began to preach Calvinism, she embraced that doctrine with all her heart. In some manner she conceived that Wesley denied "justification by faith, and insisted upon the saving merit of works," a conclusion which she arrived at without the slightest shadow of a foundation. Mr. Wesley was called upon to recant, when he had nothing to recant. Now, Mr. Shirley, a relative of the countess, and

Mr. Toplady, antagonized Wesley, being leading defenders of Calvinism. The controversy ran high. The countess and Mr. Wesley parted, never to meet again on earth. It was long years of feeling against Mr. Wesley that Lady Huntingdon lived before her mind was disabused of its error regarding him, and she came to look upon him as a man of God.

Mr. Whitefield possessed no organizing power, and so did not organize a Church or found a sect. The Countess, a woman of more than ordinary ability, undertook the work, and succeeded in founding a sect, which might have been known as Whitefieldian Methodists, but were called "The Countess of Huntingdon's Connection." At her own house, preaching and religious services were often held, and people of the upper classes attended, and many were spiritually benefited. She built many chapels in London and other parts of England, and even in Scotland. The college founded at Trevecca, in Wales, and afterwards moved to Cheshunt, Herts, was for the education of ministers, and accomplished good. She became the sole executrix of the will of George Whitefield, on his death in 1777.

After the death of Mr. Whitefield, the Calvinistic Methodists separated into three sects. 1. The Lady Huntingdon Connection, which "observed strictly the liturgical forms of the Established Church, with a settled pastorate." 2. The Tabernacle Connection, or Whitefield Methodists

who, having no bond of connection after his death, drifted into Congregationalism and Independency.

3. The Welsh Calvinistic Methodists, who continue quite thrifty unto the present, but because of their strong Calvinistic belief affiliate more with the Presbyterians than with the Methodists.

Coming back to the relations between Mr. Wesley and Mr. Whitefield, we will find that, after the first severe outburst of feeling and antagonism towards Mr. Wesley because he would not favor the doctrine of predestination, Mr. Whitefield began to modify his spirit, and write as though he desired union. In 1744, Mr. Whitefield went to America, where he remained until 1748.

In October, 1746, Whitefield wrote to Wesley a letter which evinced the dawning of a desire to bury their theological differences. "The regard I have always had for you and your brother," wrote Whitefield, "is still as great as ever, and I trust we shall give this and future ages an example of true Christian love abiding, notwithstanding differences in judgment. Why our Lord has permitted us to differ as to some points of doctrine will be discovered on the last day."

During the year 1747, Mr. Wesley wrote to Whitefield regarding a union of the societies of Methodism. To this Mr. Whitefield replied, September 11, 1747: "My heart is ready for an outward as well as an inward union. Nothing shall be wanting on my part to bring it about; but I can not

see how it can possibly be effected till we all speak and think the same things. . . . As for universal redemption, if we omit on each side the talking for or against reprobation, as we may fairly do, and agree, as we already do, in giving an universal offer to all poor sinners that will come and taste of the water of life, I think we may manage very well."

In 1748, after four years' residence in America, Whitefield landed again in England. He found many changes, and some of them greatly to his disadvantage. September 1st he wrote to Wesley from London regarding the union: "What have you thought about a union? I am afraid an external one is impracticable. I find, by your sermons, that we differ in principles more than I thought, and I believe we are upon two different plans." Whitefield found, on visiting Scotland, that he was not so great a favorite as in earlier times. On reaching Edinburgh, he found his old friends, the Seceders, "met to adopt the new-modeled scheme and covenant." "Hundreds took the oath, and solemnly engaged to use all lawful means to extirpate, not only popery, prelacy, Arminianism, Arianism, Tritheism and Sabellianism," but also "George Whitefieldism;" and "similar decisions were adopted at the Synods of Lothian, Ayr, and Glasgow." (Tyerman, Vol. II, p. 23.)

Since Whitefield determined to be an evangelist in general, and not establish societies, and Mr. Wesley was at work founding societies from one end of

England to the other, as well as evangelizing the whole country, there was little need for the opinions of these men to come in conflict. Hence we find there was a union of heart, even when there was no union of societies.

From this time forward, in the hearts of these noble men of God, only love and true fellowship abode. They had little or nothing to say to each other of their doctrinal differences. They lived as devout Christians, striving after the mastery as sons of God.

CHAPTER IX.

SCHOLARS OF ARMINIANISM.

Scholars of English and American Arminianism—Misunderstanding of the Arminian Controversy by many German Authors—Kurtz and his Church History—Arminianism never advocated Latitudinarianism—Arminianism has had Worthy Scholars—Arminian Systematic Theology—Fletcher—Benson's Description of Fletcher—Fletcher and the Quinquarticular Controversy—Statement of Arminianism—Answer to Toplady—God's Perfections honored in Arminianism—Closing Statements of the Equal Check—Essays on Bible Calvinism and Bible Arminianism—Sample of Fletcher's Style—Richard Watson—Theological Institutes—Wm. B. Pope—His Christian Theology—Dr. Adam Clarke—Clarke's Commentaries—Miner Raymond—D. D. Whedon—Freedom of the Will—Wilbur Fisk—Calvinistic Controversy—The Metaphysical Theory of Dr. Hopkins—New England Calvinism startled by "Calvinism Improved"—New Divinity of New England—Four Conclusions.

ONE of the most astonishing things in the discussion of the Arminian controversy is the apparent misunderstanding by some modern German, as well as other writers, of what Arminianism was as taught by Arminius, Episcopius, Grotius, and Limborch. Such a writer as Kurtz, in his Church History, talks about the doctrine of Arminius finding "expression in latitudinarianism, and, still worse, in Deism." He links Arminian doctrine to the Deism of Edward, Lord Herbert, of Cherbury, who "re-

duced religion to five points: Belief in God; obligation to honor him; an upright life; expiation of sin by sincere repentance; retribution in eternal life;" and to Thomas Hobbes, who "regarded Christianity as an Oriental phantom, only of importance as a support of absolute royalty, and as an antidote against revolution." (See Kurtz, Church History, Vol. II, section 40, and section 42.) He also charges that James Arminius "became more and more convinced that the dogma of an absolute predestination was antisciptural, but wandered into Pelagian paths." He also claims that the Five Articles presented by the Remonstrants to the States in 1610, "set forth a carefully-restricted semi-Pelagianism." (Kurtz, Vol. II, section 40.)

At no time or place was Arminianism connected with, under the control of, or advocated by latitudinarians or Deists. These were not necessarily the outgrowth of Arminianism, but were evolved from the direct revolt of the human heart from the commands of God to a righteous and holy life, and the pardon of sin for the merit of the atonement in Jesus Christ. It is a thing beyond comprehension how so discerning minds in most matters can be so utterly misled when they attempt to speak of Arminianism, and declare the connection between its doctrines and those so marked in their opposition to the essential principles set forth by Arminius, Episcopius, Grotius, Limborch, and many other eminent and scholarly men.

Arminianism has had worthy scholars and writers, who have thought over and through the great problems of Arminianism, and have constructed admirable and complete works in Arminian systematic theology. They have grappled the subject in all its phases, have seen how and when it was possible to construct a system of theology that should reasonably and fully explain the mystery of texts of Scripture that were in controversy, remove from many minds the doubt and gloom that resulted from considering the passages so prominently urged by the Calvinists, and have encouraged believing souls to look out upon a bright and glorious future life, which they may know as a certainty to-day. There are commentators of Arminian faith who have patiently and faithfully gone over the entire Word of God, and found reasonable and logical explanation of the Book of God. They have brought great comfort to human hearts by flooding light upon dark places. It is our purpose now to inquire as to some of these men and their works.

Rev. John William Fletcher, the Vicar of Madeley, was born at Nyon, Vaud, Switzerland, September 12, 1729. His family was very much distinguished. He was highly educated, being "master of the French, German, Latin, Hebrew, and Greek languages, which he had learned in France;" but "his theological and philosophical education was acquired at Geneva," even amid the teachings

of Calvinism. While his parents desired him to enter the ministry, he was determined to be a soldier, and gain distinction on the field of blood. He entered the army of Portugal as a captain. Soon afterwards peace was made with England, and his occupation as a soldier suddenly ended. He next went to England as a tutor. Here he came in contact with the rising Methodist societies, and in 1755 united with them. In 1757 he was ordained, in the Church of England, a priest. He was first rector at Dunham, and afterwards at Madeley. He became a model pastor, full of zeal and the Holy Ghost, and looked after all the interests of his people, both spiritually and intellectually. The description of Mr. Fletcher from the graceful pen of Benson presents him as one of nature's noblemen. "The reader," says Mr. Benson, in describing Fletcher at Trevecca, "will pardon me if he thinks I exceed; my heart kindles while I write. Here it was that I saw, shall I say an angel in human flesh? I should not far exceed the truth if I said so. But here I saw a descendant of fallen Adam so fully raised above the ruins of the fall, that, though by the body he was tied down to earth, yet was his whole conversation in heaven, yet was his life from day to day hid with Christ in God. Prayer, praise, love and zeal, all ardent, elevated above what one would think attainable in this state of frailty, were the elements in which he continually lived. Languages, arts, sciences, gram-

mar, rhetoric, logic, even divinity itself, as it is called, were all laid aside when he appeared in the school-room among the students; and they seldom hearkened long before they were all in tears, and every heart caught fire from the flame that burned in his soul."

Mr. Fletcher entered heartily into the great "Quinquarticular" or Calvinistic discussion. His "Checks to Antinomianism," in a clear and forcible manner, advocated the Arminian view of predestination and the plan of salvation, in an unanswerable argument. "They comprehend nearly every important thesis on the subject." They treat of "the highest philosophical questions, theories of freedom of the will, prescience, and fatalism." These were admirably and skillfully presented. No writer has better balanced the apparently contradictory passages of Scripture on these questions. The popular argument has never, perhaps, been more effectively drawn out. No polemical work of a former age is so extensively circulated as these "Checks."

Mr. Fletcher's statement of Arminianism is as follows: "The second covenant, then, or the gospel, is a dispensation of free grace and mercy (not only to little children, of whom is the kingdom of heaven, but also) to poor, lost, helpless sinners, who, seeing and feeling themselves condemned by the law (of innocence) and utterly unable to obtain justification upon the terms of the first cove-

nant, come to (a merciful God through) Jesus Christ (the light of men according to the helps afforded them by the dispensation which they are under) to seek in him (and from him those merits and) that righteousness which they have not in themselves. For the Son of God, being both God and man in one person, and, by the invaluable sacrifice of himself upon the cross, having suffered the punishment due to all our breaches of the law (of works), and by his most holy life having answered all the demands of the first covenant, ‘God can be just, and the justifier of him that believes in Jesus.’ Therefore, if a sinner, whose mouth is stopped, and who has nothing to pay, pleads from the heart the atoning blood of Christ (and supposing he never heard that precious name, if according to his light he implores Divine mercy, for the free exercise of which Christ’s blood has made way), not only God will not ‘deliver him to the tormentors,’ but will frankly forgive him all.” (Fletcher’s Works, Vol. I, p. 454.)

Mr. Fletcher answers Mr. Toplady, who says, “Arminianism paves the way for atheism by despoiling the Divine Being of his unlimited supremacy,” after the following manner: “No, it only teaches us that it is absurd to make God’s supremacy bear an undue proportion to his other perfections. Do we despoil the king of his manly shape, because we deny his having the head of a giant and the body of a dwarf? . . . God wisely

made free agents, that he might wisely judge them according to their works; and it is one of our objections to the modern doctrines of grace, that they despoil God of his wisdom in both these respects. . . . God does whatever pleases him in heaven, earth, and hell. But reason and Scripture testify that he does not choose to set his invincible power against his unerring wisdom, by overpowering, with saving grace or damning wrath, the men whom he is going judicially to reward or punish. . . . When we say that the promised reward which a general bestows upon a soldier for his gallant behavior in the field, depends in some measure upon the soldier's gallant behavior, do we despoil the general of his independency with respect to the soldier? Must the general, to show himself independent, necessitate some of his soldiers to fight, that he may foolishly promote them; and others to desert that he may blow their brains out with Calvinian independence? When we assert that God justifies men according to their faith, and rewards them according to their good works; or when we say that he condemns them according to their unbelief, and punishes them according to their bad works; do we intimate that he betrays the least degree of mutability? On the contrary, do we not hereby represent him as faithfully executing his eternal, immutable decree of judging and treating men according to their works of faith or of unbelief?" (Fletcher's Works, Vol. II, pp. 228, 229.)

Thus he shows in the fullest sense that Arminianism "secures to God the honor of his perfections," and "maintains that free will is dependent on free grace." He further shows that Arminians "maintain that God, in his infinite wisdom and power, has made free agents, in order to display his goodness by rewarding them if they believe and obey, or his justice by punishing them if they prove faithless and disobedient. Whichsoever of the two therefore comes to pass, God is no more 'disconcerted, disappointed, embarrassed,' etc., than a lawgiver and judge who acquits or condemns criminals according to his own law and to their own works. (Fletcher, Vol. II, pp. 229-236.)

In closing the Equal Check, Fletcher gives six conclusions founded upon Scripture which clearly show the manner in which Arminianism esteems "grace and justice:" "(1) That as God is both a Benefactor and Governor, a Savior and Judge, he has both a throne of grace and a throne of justice. (2) That those believers are highly partial who worship only before one of the divine thrones, when the sacred oracles so loudly bid us to pay our homage before both. (3) That the doctrines of grace are the statutes and decrees issuing from the former. (4) That the principle of all the doctrines of grace is, that there is an election of grace; and that the principle of all the doctrines of justice is, that there is an election of justice. (5) That the former of those elections is unconditional and partial, as

depending merely on the good pleasure of our gracious Benefactor and Savior; and that the latter of these elections is conditional and impartial, as depending merely on the justice and equity of our righteous Governor and Judge; for justice admits of no partiality, and equity never permits a ruler to judge any men but such as are free agents, or to sentence any free agent otherwise than according to his own works. (6) That the confounding or not properly distinguishing those two elections, and the reprobations which they draw after them, has filled the Church with confusion, and is the grand cause of the disputes which destroy our peace. To restore peace to the Church, these two elections must be fixed upon their proper Scriptural basis." (Fletcher's Works, Vol. II, p. 296.)

His two essays, the first on "Bible Calvinism, displaying the doctrines of partial grace, the capital error of the Pelagians and the excellency of Scripture Calvinism;" the second on "Bible Arminianism, displaying the doctrines of impartial justice, the capital error of the Calvinists, and the excellence of Scripture Arminianism," are perhaps "the most impartial, judicious, and eloquent balancing of the two systems to be found in the English language." (See Fletcher's Works, Vol. II, pp. 302-345.)

As a sample of Fletcher's use of language in polemic discussion, let us take this: "Rigid Calvin-

ism will be lost in Bible Arminianism, and rigid Arminianism will be lost in Bible Calvinism, as soon as Protestants will pay a due regard to the following truths: (1) God, for Christ's sake, dissolved, with respect to us, the paradisaical covenant of innocence, when he turned man out of a forfeited paradise into this cursed world, for having broken that covenant. Then it was that man's Creator first became his Redeemer; then mankind were placed under the first mediatorial covenant of promise. Then our Maker gave to Adam, and to all human species, which was in Adam's loins, a Savior, who was called 'The Seed of Woman, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,' who was to make the paradisaical covenant honorable by a sinless obedience. (2) Accordingly, Christ, by the grace of God, tasted death for every man; purchasing for all men the privileges of a general covenant of grace, which God made with Adam and ratified to Noah, the second general parent of mankind. (3) Christ, according to the peculiar predestination and election of God, peculiarly tasted death for the Jews, his first chosen nation and peculiar people; purchasing for them all the privileges of the peculiar covenant of grace, which the Scriptures call the Old Covenant of Peculiarity. (4) That Christ, according to the most peculiar predestination and election of God, most peculiarly tasted death for the Christians, his second chosen nation and most peculiar people; procuring for them the

invaluable privileges of his own most precious Gospel, ‘by which he has brought life and immortality to meridian light,’ and has richly supplied the defects of the Noachian and Mosaic dispensations; the first of which is noted for its darkness, and the second for its veils and shadows. And lastly, that with respect to these peculiar privileges, Christ is said to have peculiarly ‘given himself for the Christian Church, that he might cleanse it with the baptismal washing of water by the Word’ (*Ephe-sians v, 26*); peculiarly ‘purchasing it with his blood’ (*Acts, xx, 28*); and delivering it from heathenish darkness and Jewish shadows, that it might be ‘redeemed from all iniquity,’ and that his Christian people might be ‘a peculiar people to himself, zealous of good works,’ even above the Jews, who ‘fear God,’ and the Gentiles, who ‘work righteousness.’” (*Fletcher’s Works, Vol. II, pp. 339–340.*)

Richard Watson may be called the father of Methodist systematic theology constructed on the Arminian basis. He was born at Barton-on-Humber, Lincolnshire, February 22, 1781. “Wild and impetuous in youth, feeble in body but precocious in mind, he sought an education, and, though unable to pursue a full course, he succeeded by his own efforts in becoming a well-educated man. Converted when thirteen, and preaching at fifteen years of age, he started upon a career of usefulness destined to bring glory and honor, together with doctrinal stability, to the Church. As a man, Richard

Watson was one of the most conspicuous in Wesleyan Methodism at the beginning of the present century. He was a man of genius in several lines. His mind was versatile. So great were his attainments that contemporaries of other communities and beliefs spoke in the highest terms of him. Says Robert Hall: ‘He soars into regions of thought where no genius but his own can penetrate.’ The *London Quarterly Review* said: ‘Watson had not the earnestness and force of Chalmers, but he possessed much more thought, philosophy, calm ratiocination, and harmonious fullness. He had not, perhaps, the metaphysical subtlety and rapid combination, the burning affections and elegant diction of Hall, but he possessed as keen a reason, a more lofty imagination, an equal or superior power of painting, and, we think, a much more vivid perception of the spiritual world and a richer leaven of evangelical sentiment.’”

Such was the man whose heart was fired with love for all mankind, whose mind was broad enough to comprehend the teaching of the apostle, that Jesus Christ suffered death for all mankind, and the words of Jesus that “God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life,” and who had the courage of his convictions to teach this theology in a strong, scientific, masterly manner. His “Theological Institutes” is a “view of the evidences, doctrines, morals, and in-

stitutions of Christianity." It was designed to be a "book of Christianity," adapted to the present state of theological literature, neither Calvinistic on the one hand, nor Pelagian on the other. In the "advertisement" to the London edition of 1823 the author says: "The object has been to follow a course of plain and close argument on the various subjects discussed, without any attempt at embellishment of style, and without adding practical uses and reflections, which, while however important, did not fall within the plan of this publication." "The various controversies on fundamental and important points have been introduced; but it has been the sincere aim of the author to discuss every subject with fairness and candor, and honestly, but in the spirit of the Truth, which he more anxiously wishes to be taught than to teach, to exhibit what he believes to be the sense of the Holy Scriptures, to whose authority, he trusts, he has unreservedly subjected all his own opinions."

Mr. Watson devotes 467 pages to the treatment of the question of the "doctrines relating to man." The work is exhaustive. It shows the most extensive reading of Calvinistic and Arminian literature, together with heathen philosophy, and a complete collation and comparison of doctrinal sentiments. It brings out root ideas of man's condition in sin, God in Christ Jesus reconciling the world to himself, the sacrifice of Christ ample in extent and power to bring all the world to eternal salvation,

and that there is given to all men such freedom of will that they can be turned to Christ and obtain salvation, or they can, by the will, reject all offers of life and mercy, and be eternally lost. It is no great wonder that the elder Hodge says of Watson's "Institutes:" "Excellent, and well worthy of its high repute among Methodists;" or that Dr. J. W. Alexander says: "Turretin is in theology '*instar omnium*;' that is, so far as Blackstone is in law, making due allowance for difference in age. Watson, the Methodist, is the only systematizer within my knowledge who approaches the same eminence, of whom in Addison's words, 'He reasons like Paley and descants like Hall.'"

William Burt Pope, A. M., theological tutor in Didsbury College, Manchester, England, has produced a second great work on Systematic Theology, based on Arminianism. It is a compendium of "Christian Theology," and consists of "Analytical Outlines of a Course of Theological Study, Biblical Dogmatic, and Historical." His treatment of sin, original and actual, of the mediatorial ministry, or providing an universal redemption, and the administration of redemption, is fully and masterfully done. Of the universality of redemption he writes: "The price was paid down for all men for the entire race, or for the entire nature of man in all its representatives from the first transgressor to the last. Redemption as such is universal" (which forms the basis of a particular application). "The media-

torial government of the world from the beginning has been a fruit and a proof of one great deliverance." "The Scripture speaks only of one grand redemption; but it distinguishes, speaking of Him, who is the Savior of all men, specially of those that believe. Here the special is other than the general redemption, though springing from it; what makes it special is not the decree of sovereignty, but the faith of those who embrace it. . . . Hence, as there is no deliverance which is not individual, and no salvation which is not deliverance, the whole history of personal religion is exhibited in terms of Redemption: it is the release of the will, which is the universal benefit, the repentance which is bestowed by the Spirit of bondage, the release from the law of death in justification and regeneration, the redeeming from all iniquity in entire sanctification, the final expected redemption of the groaning creature, and the deliverance of the saints from the present evil world." (Pope, Vol. II, pp. 296-297.)

Dr. Adam Clarke may be recognized as the great Wesleyan Methodist divine, antiquarian, Orientalist, and commentator. As a theologian, he was Arminian excepting in regard to the eternal Sonship of Christ. The commentaries that came from his fertile pen on the lines of original sin, the atonement for sin by Christ, universal redemption, and the freedom of the will, are grounded in the Biblical teaching and Arminian thought.

Dr. Clarke was born in Moybeg, about 1762. He was a strong boy in physical character, but was dull of mind, until, smarting under the sarcasms of school-fellows, he suddenly aroused from his mental lethargy, and at once began such a study as far outstripped all his fellows and placed him in the front rank of the world's greatest scholars. The Commentary of Dr. Clarke was the work of years, he being about thirty years in its composition. It at once became a standard work, was extensively circulated, and held its place in the front rank for many years. Even now, although somewhat superseded by later works, it is a standard for reference, and wields an influence far beyond the limits of Methodism.

In America have appeared writers and theologians holding and advocating the Arminian view as strongly as any in Europe. The work of Miner Raymond, D. D., for a long time a professor in the Garrett Biblical Institute, will stand as a great authority in systematic theology. It is pre-eminently Arminian in its doctrine, and equally evangelistic. At no time has there been any adverse criticism of this work as to its Arminian character.

But it is probable that D. D. Whedon, LL. D., for so long a time editor of the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, and a successful commentator upon the New Testament Scriptures, has added more largely to the occult matter of Arminianism and shown the in-

consistency of Calvinistic theories, than any other man of the last half of the present century. Whedon's "Freedom of the Will as a Basis of Human Responsibility and Divine Government" is a work of remarkable breadth of thought, acumen of research, and clear statement. It is a "substantial contribution to the most difficult of all psychological and moral problems, the reconciliation of the sense of capital responsibility with our intellectual conclusions regarding the nature of the choice." Dr. Whedon defines "will" to be that power of the soul by which it intentionally originates an act or state of being. Or, more precisely, will is the power of the soul by which it is the conscious author of an intentional act. (*Freedom of Will*, p. 15.) In treating of the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, Dr. Whedon speaks of it as an "unnecessary hypothesis," and proceeds to construct the system of God's divine government after the Arminian hypothesis.

Another strong controversial Arminian writer was Rev. Wilbur Fisk, D. D., President of Wesleyan University. His work bore the title "Calvinistic Controversy: Embracing a Sermon on Predestination and Election." It was especially designed to show the fallacies of New England theology in particular, and predestination or election in general. Dr. Fisk aimed to show that "the Calvinistic predestination is, on any grounds of consist-

ency; utterly irreconcilable with mental freedom." He spent considerable time on the changes in Calvinism in New England, and the "indefiniteness of Calvinism" as a system. The "Metaphysical Theory of Dr. Hopkins," which had for its leading dogma that "God was the efficient cause of all moral action, holy and unholy, and that holiness consisted in disinterested benevolence," was shown to be consistent with the question put to a person desirous of judging of the possession of a religious experience: "Are you willing to be damned?" If willing, it was a wholesome sign that the will was made to be in harmony with God; but if not willing to be damned, he was yet in his sins.

Dr. Fisk demonstrated the tendency of the human mind to run into extremes, illustrating it by Calvinism, from which there was a revolt which found no one standing on the middle line in the exact place of truth, and went to the other extreme of New England Unitarianism and Universalism. The Church was startled when a posthumous book of a Calvinistic clergyman appeared, entitled "Calvinism Improved." "It was merely an extension of the doctrine of unconditional election and irresistible grace to all, instead of a part. From the premises the reasoning seemed fair, and the conclusions legitimate. This made many converts. And the idea of universal salvation, when once it is embraced, can easily be molded into any shape, provided its main feature is retained. It has finally

pretty generally run into the semi-infidel sentiments of no atonement, no Divine Savior, no Holy Ghost, and no supernatural change of heart; as well as no hell, no devil, no angry God." (Fisk's Calvinistic Controversy, p. 88.)

Dr. Fisk unmasked the subtleties of the "New Divinity" of New England, which had been advocated by the theological professors of Yale College of his day. It had two pillars: 1. Sin is not a propagated property of the human soul, but consists wholly in moral exercise; 2. Sin is not the necessary means of the greatest good. The results of such tenets are clearly to be seen. Point after point in the arguments of the Predestinarianist was taken up, and the opposite views of Arminianism were presented in the rich but terse style of Dr. Fisk. Calvinism was shown to be antagonized by Arminianism upon a thoroughly rational basis. The entire controversy was carried out in a masterly, learned, and Christian spirit.

Having thus far traced the history of the growth and development of the system of Arminianism, it is not necessary to carry this particular thought further. We are led to certain conclusions which are inevitable from the facts which have been adduced.

(1) Arminianism is not the product of late periods in the nineteen centuries about past, but was a line of doctrine held and advocated by the apostles and the fathers of the early Church. The introduction of this system of theology by Koorn-

hert, Simon Episcopius, and others, was not an innovation upon any of the systems which had been invented and promulgated, but was a return to the thought of the primitive Christians.

(2) The advocacy of Arminianism, in its day, was looked upon as almost a crime, and those who have stood out in the front ranks of its advocacy have been often branded with holding doctrines diametrically opposed to the teaching of Jesus Christ—a statement that is not true; for no class of men have ever been stronger and more rigid in their advocacy of the Holy Scriptures and primitive Christianity than these Arminians.

(3) Upon the principles of Arminianism there can be constructed a systematic theology which shall be in perfect harmony with the teachings of Jesus Christ and the inspired apostles, and the consciousness of believing hearts under the influences and enlightenment of the Holy Spirit.

(4) The work of those who have adopted the Arminian system of theology has not been to tear down or prevent the work of other systems, but has gone out to the low and wicked of the world, and has lifted up a redeemed humanity, and brought it into communion with the Divine Being, until it has been filled with the power of divine love, and been able to accomplish the greatest work in human elevation. It has moved forward steadily in the times and conditions of persecution, and has sought for but one thing; namely, the glory of God

and the salvation of men. During this time it has been exerting a powerful influence for good, upon the old Calvinian theology on the one hand, and the latitudinarianism of Pelagianism, Socinianism, and Universalism on the other hand, bringing the rigid more nearly to the line of the Scripture, and restraining the others from going far away into the darkness of sin.

CHAPTER X.

ARMINIANISM AND THE FRIENDS.

Revolt of the Friends from Predestination—George Fox— Led into a Study of Predestination—Meditation and Prayer—Searched the Scriptures—Worshiped much— Greatly persecuted—A Devout People—Barclay's Denunciation of Predestination Unconditional—Nine Reasons against it—Barclay's Doctrine of Atonement Essentially Arminian—Barclay's Apology—King Charles II and Barclay's Apology—Thomas Evans—New Statement of Doctrine made at Richmond, Indiana—Delegates from all the Friends' Societies in the World—The Creed of the Society of Friends is Arminian throughout.

WHEN a doctrine of so revolting a nature as that of unconditional predestination and reprobation is extensively advocated, and is thereby widespread over the world, it may be expected that sooner or later minds will revolt therefrom, and publicly dissent from the thralldom of such doctrines, and seek for something better and more in harmony with the written Word of God. Arminianism was such a revolt. Strong and thoughtful minds could not read the Word and find the predestination doctrine in it. This revolt spread far and wide. It influenced many minds. It was not necessary that all should take the exact form of Arminianism in order to be in a similar revolt. There were several centers of revolt, from

which issued lines of influence of greater or less degree. These moved many minds in Europe. It was not necessary that these centers should have any real or implied connection until after the doctrines were well advanced, and the discussions so far advanced as to give promise that they could not be overturned. The testimony of history is that, in the early part of the seventeenth century, there were in different parts of Europe taught doctrines bearing a striking resemblance to those of Arminius and Episcopius. The doctrines of Calvinism had been widespread. They had been taught in all their repulsiveness. Men of broader and more liberal views revolted from such teaching, and searched out a better method of interpreting the Divine mind and "decrees" than that pursued at Geneva.

One of the prominent peoples in those later years, who, a little later than the day of James Arminius, arose and began the revolt from predestinationism and reprobation unconditionally, was the Friends, or Quakers. They had their origin in George Fox, born at Leicestershire, England, in 1624, of pious parents, members of the Anglican Church. These godly parents taught him the ways of religion early in life, and he was religiously inclined at an early age. In the consciousness that his relation to God needed to be intensified, at nineteen years of age he was "led by a sense of duty to seek retirement from the world, and he spent much time in reading the Holy Scriptures, with

meditation and prayer. In the year 1647 he began to appear as a preacher of the gospel, and he found many prepared to receive his messages of love, calling them away from a reliance upon all rites and ceremonies to the Word of divine grace, or Spirit of Christ, as the efficient cause of salvation." It was not long before there were converts to his doctrine, and the numbers attending upon his preaching were very large. These converts spent much time in divine worship, waiting in silence for the coming of God's Spirit into them with enlightenment. When the Spirit came, they prayed, praised, and preached as they felt, under the Spirit of God.

From the first, George Fox preached that "whosoever would, might come to God by Jesus Christ, and be eternally saved." While he and his followers did not denounce or attack the doctrine of election and reprobation as held by the Reformed Church, they did, in the most emphatic manner, teach the freedom of the will and a full salvation for all men on the condition of repentance of sin and faith in Jesus Christ. So successful was Fox in advocating his liberal theories that, at his death in 1690, there were at least 75,000 members of the body of Friends. They developed splendid talent. George Fox, William Penn, William Pennington, and Robert Barclay were men of no ordinary talent, and were brilliant expositors of the new doctrine.

The Society of Friends has been greatly perse-

cuted at times, has suffered at the hands of enemies, governments, and schisms; but it has held on its way in the strong advocacy of the doctrines early formulated, which encouraged sinners to venture fully on the merits of a crucified and risen Christ for salvation. They have never known that there was any difference in the mind of the Father toward human souls when he devised the plan of redemption, or in the mind of Jesus when he became incarnate and perfected the atonement. They taught that Jesus died for all men.

The character of the early Society of Friends as a devout people, and their antagonism to the predestination and reprobation of men unconditionally, is found in their writings. Robert Barclay recited the doctrines of Calvinism in such terms as evinced that he was fully conversant with them. He used the terms, "eternal and immutable decree," "predestinated to eternal damnation the far greater part of mankind," "without any respect to their disobedience or sin," "for the demonstrating of the glory of its justice," etc., in precisely the same sense as the Genevan theologians used them. Barclay called this a "horrible and blasphemous doctrine." He gave reasons: 1. "It is a novelty; for it was not known for the first four hundred years after Christ." 2. "It is highly injurious to God, because it makes him the author of sin." 3. "It makes God delight in the death of sinners." 4. It renders "Christ's mediation ineffectual." 5. "It

makes the preaching of the gospel a mere mock and illusion." 6. "It makes Christ's coming, and sacrifice a testimony of God's wrath to the world, and one of the greatest judgments," for it saves a very few of the race. 7. "It renders mankind in a far worse condition than the devils in hell." 8. The preaching of Christ's gospel is an absurdity, for it "makes the Lord to send forth his servants with a lie in their mouth," commanding them to invite all men to come to him and be saved, when only a very few are called and can come. 9. It makes prayer for sinners of no avail, and places Paul in a foolish light before the world when he exhorts Timothy, "that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men." Barclay, and all of his followers, started back with horror from the Calvinistic doctrine of reprobation irrespective of condition.

On the other hand, Mr. Barclay places the atonement by the sufferings and shedding of blood of Jesus Christ as the central doctrine of Christianity, and out of it comes the other great doctrine so full of spiritual comfort, that, by this full atonement, salvation is made possible for all men. He cites many proofs, all of which are held by the Friends' Society unto this day. He shows: 1. That it is positively affirmed in the Scripture. 2. Christ doth not will that any should perish. 3. The doctrine is abundantly confirmed by the Apostle John. 4. Augustine said in commenting on the ninety-fifth

Psalm: "The blood of Christ is of so great worth that it is of no less value than the whole world."

5. Others of the fathers of the Church uttered as strong language. 6. God, out of his infinite love, sent his Son, who tasted death for every man, Jew or Gentile, Turk or Scythian, Indian or barbarian, and made it possible for them to be saved. 7. God sends his Light and Seed to invite, call, exhort, and strive with every man in order to save him.

Mr. Barclay proceeds to show that since "God willeth no man to perish," he hath therefore "given to all grace sufficient for salvation." God offers to work this salvation during the day of every man's visitation, "by giving to every man a measure of saving, sufficient, and supernatural light and grace." In the Parable of the Sower, Christ tells "that this saving Light and Seed, or a measure of it, is given to all." By this Light and Seed "many have been and some may be saved, to whom the gospel hath never been outwardly preached, and who are utterly ignorant of the outward history of Christ." "If all men have received a loss from Adam which leads to condemnation, then all men have received a gift from Christ which leads to justification."

The above selections from Barclay's "Apology for the True Christian Divinity," and many more that might be quoted, are conclusive evidence of the revolt in many of the English minds against the doctrines of predestination and reprobation uncondi-

tional, as taught by Calvin and Beza at Geneva. To Barclay there was an intolerable repugnance to them. While in Holland, and elsewhere on the Continent, was going on this debate between Arminians and Calvinists, in England Barclay and his followers were striking right and left against the doctrines of Calvinism. The contest in England was not quite so turbulent as on the Continent, but it was as sharp and determined. Men of culture were on either side. The stores of Greek and Latin literature were open, and poured out plentifully on either side.

Barclay's *Apology* was sent to King Charles II in 1675, and was designed to set forth fully and truly the doctrines and polity of the Friends. The king was in error as to the nature, design, and conduct of this people. He had been led to look upon them as dangerous to his interests and the welfare of the English Commonwealth. Hence, it became Barclay to take the teachings of George Fox and the followers of this man of God, and clearly set forth the real doctrines and character of the Friends. As an *Apology* it was masterly. It then stood the test of criticism, and has so stood up to this date.

If we follow the course of doctrinal teaching of the Friends, it will be found that they have maintained the same belief under all changes. In the book by Thomas Evans, bearing the title "*A Concise Account of the Religious Society of Friends,*

Commonly Called Quakers," and published by authority of the society, there is clearly stated the belief of the people regarding the extent of salvation provided by the death of Jesus Christ. "Therefore, Christ hath tasted death for every man; not only for all kinds of men, as some vainly talk, but for every man of all kinds; the benefit of whose offering is not only extended to those who have the distinct outward knowledge of his death and sufferings, as the same is declared in the Scriptures, but even unto those who are necessarily excluded from the benefit of this knowledge by some inevitable accident." (Page 93. Ed. published by Friends' Bookstore, 304 Arch Street, Philadelphia.)

When the Society of Friends determined to formulate a new Creed, or "Declaration of some of the Fundamental Principles of Christian Truth," it was not to change any of the vital doctrines held for so many years, or to indicate that they were weary of or wavered in anything held by the fathers of their sect, but to state these great and fundamental truths in the language of this day.

The Conference assembled in Richmond, Indiana, the ninth month 23, 1887. It was formed of delegates from all the yearly meetings of the world. They were among the strongest and most thoughtful men of the entire society. They were scholarly and learned in doctrine. Many were giants in debate, as the stenographic report evidences. They came to the work of reviewing the

doctrines and usages of the Friends with a clear insight into the motives leading thereto, and as clear a comprehension of what effects would flow from a restatement of their doctrines, and the dangers attending the same. After determining that it was desirable that "all yearly meetings of Friends in the world should adopt one declaration of Christian faith," they took up the old statements of Fox, Penn, Barclay, and others, and held them in the light of all the Calvinistic, Pelagian, Socinian, and skeptical discussions and controversies from 1647 to 1887, and after carefully, thoughtfully, and prayerfully examining them with the light of two hundred and forty years shed upon them, they adopted the same formularies, only changing the verbiage so as to conform with the style of language of to-day. Unchanged stands their doctrine of a universal salvation provided for all men, and enjoyed by every man who, by repentance and faith, comes to Jesus Christ. They are Arminian throughout. No uncertain sound is given regarding original sin, freedom of the will, or the sufficiency of grace. Whosoever will, may come to Jesus Christ and be saved. By this declaration of faith they demonstrated to the world that they are satisfied with the doctrines of the Fathers, they have no apologies to make for preaching a salvation provided for all men, they have not been disturbed by controversies or changed by every wind of doctrine, but steadily hold on to the old faith, and recognize the old landmarks.

CHAPTER XI.

ARMINIANISM AND REVIVALS.

Arminianism in Contact with Sin and Sinners—A Revival and Evangelizing Doctrine—A System that can be preached in all its Fullness—Characters of a Good Revival—A Revival and its Two Parts—Elements of a Revival—Consciousness of a Need of Revival—Active Effort—Presence and Co-operation of the Holy Spirit—A Free and Full Provision—Consistent Lives of those promoting a Revival—People must be awakened—The Slumbering Consciences of Sinners must be aroused—Easier to reach Sinners in a Revival than at other Times—Arminianism in a Revival—Does not need to drop any of her Doctrines—Need not repress any Emotion—Instance of Repressed Emotion and the Ending of a Revival—Arminianism enforces her Doctrine with a Single Purpose—Arminianism can commence her Revival at any Point in the Round of Doctrine—All Revivals must be carried on under the Teaching of a Free Salvation—It is not Possible to have a Successful Revival and preach the Doctrines of Predestination—President Charles G. Finney—D. L. Moody—A Presbyterian Revivalist.

THE friends and advocates of Arminianism claim that it is a strong power, a living force, adapted to meet the wants of the hungry, sin-sick souls of dying men, and bring them into life and happiness. It is the great revival form of doctrine, free from all objectionable elements, and which takes hold of sinners, and, by the Holy Spirit's

power, leads to true enlightenment and assurance of salvation. It has this power because of inherent characters. It produces no revolt from itself, though it leads to revolt from sin. It is a natural, consistent, harmonious, symmetrical, and easily-understood presentation to the mind of the sinner of his natural state, "dead in trespasses and sin," and shows how he may turn to the Son of God, who died on the cross for the possible salvation of the sinner, and become certain that, having godly sorrow and confession of sin to God, he may by faith appropriate the merit of Christ's sacrifice to himself, and his sins be fully and freely pardoned. It satisfies the seeker after light and pardon as no other system. It discovers the ennobling elements in God's scheme of salvation.

The revival of religion has two parts to its meaning: 1. It refers to a renewal of interest in the matters of religion on the part of persons who already know of and enjoy a degree of light and knowledge. 2. It refers to the awakening of sinners to a consciousness of their lost estate in sin, and their earnest inquiry for the way of light and pardon, and their entrance into that state of blessed enjoyment and assurance. Whenever there is a rousing of the Church from spiritual slumber and the quickening of the life of believers by the Holy Ghost, there is a corresponding awakening and conversion of sinners.

There are certain well-defined elements that must

enter into a genuine revival, and without which there can be no permanent reform.

1. There must be among those connected with a revival movement a consciousness that all men are by nature sinners, that the bite of the serpent has infected all mankind with a tainted nature, and that those who are not now renewed by Divine grace and pardoned are actual sinners. Until there is the deep consciousness of sin, and a corresponding realization of the sinfulness of sin, there will be but little or no turning to God.

2. There must be an active effort of the renewed souls to urge upon the unrenewed the importance of turning to God through Jesus Christ for pardon and renewal. By this activity of already renewed souls there will be a sensible influence exerted upon the souls of the unrenewed to lead them to serious consideration of their state. By this individual influence minds destitute of God's favor are led to solemn thought, a consideration of the importance of the soul's salvation, and the danger of delay. A revival never takes on its best and strongest character until there is this individual effort.

3. There needs to be the presence and co-operation of the Holy Spirit, which Jesus promised to the Apostolic Church, and through them to all ages of the Church, to go with them and convict of sin and a judgment to come, and re-enforce human agencies. The Holy Spirit goes before the human word in preaching, exhortation, warning, or counsel,

and then it follows with its silent but all-powerful influence.

4. There must be the preaching to, and teaching of, sinners that Jesus Christ has made a full atonement for the sins of our first parents, and for all sins of all generations of men. The sinner must be made to feel that the atonement has been made for him in person. He must look upon it as an individual and not a collective atonement. God does not save men in masses but singly. There is a universal atonement, and not a limited one. It must be made possible for all the world to be saved through the blood of Jesus, and not one in ten. This is one of the most important things connected with a great revival. Men must be led to feel a personal necessity, and that for all men there is a personal opportunity. As long as men have a fear that it is not possible for them to be saved, because God has failed to make provision for them, they will not be inclined to seek Christ and live.

5. There must be consistent lives on the part of those who promote revivals, to back up the precepts taught and illustrate what Divine grace can do by what it has done. God will not work through defiled agents. He will unmask the deceitful and unholy, who pretend to work for him, and show the hollowness of their lives. Even the sinners who want to turn to God and "seek salvation," detect the evil in human lives, and allow them to be stumbling-blocks and hindrances to their salvation.

6. There must come into the hearts and minds of the community, and especially of those who are awakened, the consciousness that the revival is the work of God, and that men are only agents in the hands of God for accomplishing what he purposes. The work of God, as distinguished from the work of man, is really and truly of the highest character.

7. There must be an effort to rouse the slumbering conscience of dying sinners, that they may see how dangerous their state without salvation, and how by delay they peril the highest interests of their immortal souls for all eternity. The means employed must be earnest prayer, wafted heavenward on wings of a strong faith ; holy song, full of awakening sentiments and convicting thought, sent forth with notes of sweetest cadence ; exhortations individually and in the congregation, breathing the fullness of redeeming love, with human sympathy and affection ; preaching that sets forth strong doctrine in clear-cut words, terse sentences, and clearly understood thoughts, with appeals, warnings, entreaties and persuasions of the sinner to turn to Christ for pardon immediately.

When a revival of religion is in full blast, and the hearts of believers are all alive to the importance of the work, and on fire with holy zeal, it does not seem nearly so hard for a soul to come to Jesus and be pardoned and renewed as when the Church is cold, the revival fires gone out, and extra

services are closed. This is not strange, for God speaks of set times to favor Zion. The spirit of faith is stronger sometimes than at others. The atmosphere is sometimes surcharged with feeling, emotion, and concern. The spirit of consecration is more general in the Church. Seize these times of extraordinary feeling for the salvation of souls, and multitudes may find pardon, and experience redeeming love.

How does Arminianism enter such a revival condition and time? What advantages has Arminianism over other systems of belief in a revival? These questions are answered quite readily:

1. Arminianism does not need to drop any of her doctrines regarding God in his relation to man; or regarding man in relation to God or his fellows; or regarding man's necessity for salvation, or the possibility of salvation being provided for all men; or regarding the instantaneous and conscious knowledge of sins forgiven; or regarding justification, regeneration, and entire sanctification. Arminianism holds all of these in their Biblical, natural, and logical order, and perfectly in harmony with the conditions under which man is found to exist. Arminianism does not need to repress any of the emotions of the sinner when his sorrow crushes him to the earth and pictures before him the awful realities of damned spirits, nor hold him back when the light of love and the voice of pardon enters the soul, and he rises a new creature in Jesus

Christ, and forcibly says: "Hallelujah! I'm saved; my sins are all forgiven; I'm free!" With that rejoicing soul, just born into the kingdom, Arminianism rejoices also, and praises God in ecstasies of the redemption.

We know of a little Methodist church in a college town of another church. A revival was in progress in the church. Some citizens were converted, and some students attending the college were attracted to the meetings, and, becoming awakened, found pardon at the Methodist altar. The work spread, and two or three meetings were held in the college chapel, which was used as a church for that denomination. God's presence was felt, and one or two persons became greatly blessed. One of these arose and began to tell of his experience, and praised God for what he had done in his soul, and, in so doing, raised his voice above what was esteemed the keynote of propriety. The venerable college president arose, shaking his cane over his head, and cried out: "None of that; none of that here. We will not have fox-fire in this place." The Spirit was quenched. The anxiety among his students subsided. It was over twenty-five years before another revival visited that college and its church. It did not again occur until one of the wild Juniors of the college came to the Methodist Church, which had steadily grown during these years, and was converted, and, through the burning zeal of his first love, the firebrand of re-

vival was carried to the college, and a glorious blaze of light began to burst forth.

2. Arminianism has a peculiar advantage in that she preaches and enforces the single doctrine that all men are sinners, but Christ Jesus died to make an atonement for the sins of all the world, so that it is possible for all to be saved. Somehow the human heart delights in the thought that it is not left out of the promise. "For me, Christ died," he says, and repeats with a fervor born of deep desire: "'For me the Savior died." Of all conditions the most undesirable is to go to a sorrowing and sobbing sinner, and tell him that we can't be certain that it is possible for him to be saved. He may be passed by. He may be reprobated, a predamned lost one. In all the history of the Christian Church, Arminianism has never been forced to utter, either directly or indirectly, or impliedly, such a sentence of despair. But hope, blessed hope, is held out to the sinner. "Christ died to save you" rings out in glad refrain, and touches his ears, and soon reverberates through his whole soul, and he lives.

3. Arminianism is able to commence her revival-work at any point of doctrine. One revivalist commences at the doctrine of depravity, and leads up to an atonement in Jesus Christ, and rousing revivals attend his labors. Another commences with the new life in the Church, and seeks to bring its members to their knees in a consecration of all

to God, and preparation for work. He seeks to receive a pentecostal shower. Then he leads his forces against the ranks of the wicked, and hundreds fall under the word of preaching, exhortation, personal appeal, singing the songs of Zion, and fervent prayer, and are happily converted and brought into Christ's fold. Another starts in at the point of entire sanctification, and follows this with all the persistency of a conscientious man of God, and not only are hundreds of believers sanctified, but as many sinners are justified. Arminians may start from any point in their doctrines, and go out with revival power, and always reach the same results—a gracious revival and many souls converted.

Arminianism is the only successful revival doctrinal system. The following proposition is readily maintained: In all cases of a revival in the Church, where success attends, Calvinists are compelled to surrender for the time being their Calvinistic doctrines of predestination and reprobation, and preach and teach practically Arminianism, or the provision of salvation for all men. If they commence to preach that a certain portion of the race are predestinated to salvation, and the remainder are reprobated to eternal loss in perdition, the inquiry immediately arises in the sinner's mind, "To which class do I belong?" Since it is impossible to tell, according to that theory or system of theology to which he belongs, discouragement fills the mind,

and dark forebodings and dread uncertainty fill the soul.

Let us refer to examples to substantiate this position:

1. President Charles G. Finney, of Oberlin, Ohio, became one of the most prominent and successful revivalists of the Congregational Church. He published a book of "Lectures on Revivals of Religion," which may be read by the young or old minister with great profit. So far as I can find, from beginning to end, he lays aside all thoughts or expressions of predestination, and preaches, lectures and teaches—not in so many words, but actually—the soundest doctrines of Arminianism that man ever heard. This is true of his sermons on "Prevailing Prayer," "The Prayer of Faith," "Means to be Used with Sinners," and "How to Preach the Gospel." In his sermon on "How to Preach the Gospel," Dr. Finney very clearly teaches that in a revival the doctrines of predestination can not be preached. "The gospel should be preached in those proportions," says Finney, "that the whole gospel may be brought before the minds of the people, and produce its proper influence. If too much stress is laid on one class of truths, the Christian character will not have its due proportions. Its symmetry will not be perfect. If that class of truths be almost exclusively dwelt upon that requires great exertion of intellect, without being brought home to the heart and conscience, it will

be found that the Church will be indoctrinated in those views, will have their heads filled with notions, but will not be awake and active and efficient in the promotion of religion. . . . When I entered the ministry, there had been so much said about the doctrine of election and sovereignty, that I found it was the universal hiding-place, both of sinners and of the Church, that they could not do anything, or could not obey the gospel. And wherever I went, I found it indispensable to demolish these refuges of lies. And a revival would in no way be produced or carried on, but by dwelling on that class of truths which hold up man's ability, and obligation, and responsibility. This was the only class of truths that would bring sinners to submission." (Finney's Lectures, p. 188.)

2. Mr. Dwight L. Moody has been before the Christian world for years as a revivalist. Having heard him in the midst of his meetings, we have never once heard him preach any other than the most perfect Arminianism regarding man's ability to be saved, and the universality of the provision of atonement. Nor do his books reveal in any sense the predestination doctrine, but the ability of every sinner to come to God through the merits of Jesus Christ, and receive pardon by the gift of the Spirit of God. His preaching of this full and free gospel has shaken the sandy foundations of thousands of sinners.

3. It was our privilege to attend some of the

meetings of a prominent Presbyterian revivalist in a Presbyterian Church, and hear his sermons. He was an eloquent preacher, a true expositor of the Bible, earnest in presenting the truth, and successful in entreating sinners to turn from their sins and accept Christ, and be saved. He never once spoke of divine sovereignty, and the decrees of God, the effectual call or predestination, but he constantly enforced the declaration that all men are sinners, Christ Jesus died to save sinners, and whosoever will may come to the water of life freely, and partake to their soul's salvation. He preached to dying men a free and full gospel to all men.

In closing this sketch of Arminianism in History, it is just to say that it has been prepared in the spirit of kindly inquiry, backed by a desire to know of the great Arminian controversy, and its struggle to bring again into active exercise the doctrines that prevailed in the early Church to near the end of the fifth century. This is far from being an exhaustive work. It is, however, a connected and true account of one of the world's greatest theological controversies. May it do good!

APPENDIX.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARMINIUS, ARMINIANISM, AND WRITINGS FOR, AGAINST, AND EXPLANATORY THEREOF.

THE WORKS OF JAMES ARMINIUS, D. D., translated from the Latin, in three volumes, by James Nicols and Rev. W. R. Bagnall, A. M., 1853. This work presents "all the theological works of Arminius, the publication of which was ever sanctioned by himself or friends." The first volume contains his five masterly orations on great theological questions; namely, "The Priesthood of Christ," "The Object of Theology," "The Author and the End of Theology," The Certainty of Sacred Theology," and "On Reconciling Religious Dissensions among Christians." Here is found Arminius's "Declaration of Sentiments," "Apology against Thirty-one Defamatory Articles," and nine questions exhibited for the purpose of obtaining an answer from each of the professors of Divinity, and the replies which James Arminius gave to them.

The second volume contains seventy-nine private disputationes, a dissertation on the true and genuine sense of the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, a letter to Hippolytus à Collibus on thirty-nine other articles of lesser importance.

The third volume contains an epistolary discussion concerning predestination, between James Arminius, D. D., and Francis Junius, D. D., examination of a treatise concerning the order and mode of predestination and the amplitude of Divine grace, by William Perkins,

a theological writer of England, and an analysis of the ninth chapter of Romans.

IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF ARMINIUS, a Monograph, by Rev. William F. Warren, D. D., LL. D., President of Boston University; pp. 52. Excellent so far as it goes.

HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION OF GERHARDT BRANDT, translated into English by Chamberlayer; London, 1720; four volumes.

ARMINIANISM: Article in MCCLINTOCK AND STRONG'S CYCLOPÆDIA. An excellent and strong article. Also articles in the Encyclopædia Britannica and Schaff's edition of Herzog. These articles are only satisfactory as an outline of the life and labors of Arminius and of the doctrines taught. In general they are quite fair in stating the present thought as to Arminianism in the Methodist Churches, but do not give any view as to what Arminianism has done for other Churches and beliefs. The student will find it very necessary to make a careful search elsewhere to find the real influence of the doctrines of Arminianism.

MEMOIRS OF SIMON EPISCOPIUS, the celebrated pupil of Arminius, by Frederick Calder; pp. 478. This is a superior work, and clearly portrays the struggle of Arminianism in the Synod of Dort. The work was published by Mason and Lane, New York Methodist Book Concern, in 1837. It is the best work now within the reach of students on this interesting subject. In this work there is a clear account of the character of the gentle Arminius, of the scholarly Uytenbogaert, the cultivated Hugo Grotius, and of the great statesman Barneveldt. Here is an epitome of the sentiments of Gomarus and Arminius, as they confronted each other. It contains the Constitution of the Dutch Church, Episcopius's Oration in the University of Leyden, the chal-

lence to the members of the Synod of Dort to debate on the questions of predestination, the Five Articles of Arminianism that controvert the Five Points of Calvinism, Barneveldt and his relation to Arminianism, together with other equally important matters.

ARMINIUS: Article by Dr. Wm. F. Warren, in the Methodist Quarterly Review of July, 1857. This is an excellent and thoughtful production, and carefully weighs the character of Arminianism, and compares it with the Calvinism of the times.

HAGENBACH'S HISTORY OF DOCTRINES, translated by Dr. Smith, in Sections 225-235, gives a fair statement concerning Arminianism.

ALZOG'S UNIVERSAL CHURCH HISTORY (Roman Catholic), Vol. III, pp. 326-330, has a few pages regarding the controversies in Reformed and Lutheran Churches, in which he gives only a part of the great struggle between Arminianism and Calvinism. The article furnishes food for thought. It is profitable to know what a party antagonistic to both Arminianism and Calvinism thinks of the controversy.

SYMBOLISM, by J. A. Moehler, D. D.; translated from the German by James Burton Robertson. Two volumes of the London edition are put in one of the American edition, pp. 496-505. Dr. Moehler was a Roman Catholic writer, and at times was not inclined to give full credit to what he chose to call the sects. Upon the whole, what he says is worthy of consideration. He speaks wholly of the doctrines of Arminius as held by the Methodists, and the "religious state of England at the beginning of the eighteenth century."

COMPENDIUM OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY, by Pope. This able English Methodist work on Systematic Theology is

a monument of excellence and industry. It devotes many pages of the first and second volumes to a discussion of Arminianism and Arminius. He makes very judicious comparisons of the Arminianism of Methodism of the close of the nineteenth century with the Arminianism of the beginning of the seventeenth century. Dr. Pope shows the shades of difference between Arminius and Hugo Grotius. The nice distinctions are preserved between the various doctors of the Arminian faith and of the Roman and Presbyterian teachers.

FLETCHER'S CHECKS TO ANTINOMIANISM. These books, four volumes, are the work of Rev. John Fletcher, Vicar of Madeley, one of Mr. Wesley's most valued followers. He had a well-disciplined mind, an acute discernment between Scripture truth and the theories of men, a ready formulation of his thoughts into sentences that were made to mean just what he intended them to mean. Mr. Fletcher's writings are standards in the Methodist Churches throughout the world. The passages especially devoted to James Arminius and Arminianism are numerous, and are best found by the General Index, placed in the fourth volume. Fletcher gives an excellent reason why Arminianism became so popular in the reigns of King James and Charles I, in England.

THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTES, by Richard Watson, two volumes, is a systematic theology constructed upon the Arminian doctrine as its basis. Richard Watson was a follower of Mr. Wesley, of a cultured mind, a clear perception of truth, a profound devotion to God, and competent fully to discuss the most abtruse propositions. He was a careful and accurate student of theology, was calm in manner, of extensive reading, and great devotion to what he conceived to be the truth. The Institutes have for years been a standard of Methodist doc-

trine, and have been put into the hands of the young preachers as a text-book on doctrines.

THE LIFE OF JAMES ARMINIUS D. D., written in Latin by Casper Brandt, Remonstrant minister, Amsterdam, and translated by John Guthrie, A. M., is a valuable contribution to the history of Arminianism. It was published by the Book Concern of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. The introduction to this work by Dr. Thomas O. Summers is an excellent balancing of the character of Arminius, the pure doctrines of Arminianism, and the "Semi-Pelagianism in the Church of England, and Semi-Socinianism in the Churches of New England."

ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS.

ARMINIAN DOCTRINE OF SELF-DETERMINATION. S. C. Bruce. *Theological Review*, Vol. V, p. 371.

ARMINIAN VIEW OF THE FALL AND REDEMPTION. D. D. Whedon. *Methodist Quarterly Review*, Vol. XXI, p. 647.

ARMINIANISM AND CALVINISM. *Christian Observer*. Vol. I, p. 787.

ARMINIANISM AND GRACE. J. C. Rankin. *Princeton Review*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 38.

PRINCETON REVIEW ON ARMINIANISM. *Methodist Quarterly Review*, Vol. XVI, p. 257.

CONTROVERSY ON ARMINIANISM IN THE LOW COUNTRIES. *Methodist Quarterly Review*, Vol. IV, pp. 425-556.

DIFFICULTIES OF ARMINIANISM. S. Comfort. *American Methodist Magazine*, Vol. XXI, p. 319.

HISTORIC ARMINIANISM. *Boston Review*, Vol. I, p. 287.

INCONSISTENCIES AND ERRORS OF ARMINIANISM. Southern Review, New Series, Vol. XXII, p. 464.

JAMES ARMINIUS. W. F. Warren. Methodist Review, Vol. XVII, p. 345.

ARMINIUS AND ARMINIANS IN HOLLAND. Methodist Magazine, Vol. XXXVI, p. 23.

ARMINIUS AND ARMINIANISM. Christian Examiner, Vol. LXVIII, p. 393.

INDEX.

ARMINIANISM, at Synod of Dort, 8; preached on Boston Common, 9; taught freedom of the will, 11; defined, 11; erroneous statements concerning, 13; Third Proposition, 111; Fourth Proposition, 113; Fifth Proposition, 114; not killed at Synod of Dort, 129; in England, 131; in its Wesleyan growth, 156; of the Friends, 200; in revivals, 209; drops no doctrine in a revival, 214; Five Articles, 65, 68.

Angelica, mother of Arminius, 15.

Augustine and Augustinism, 8, 13, 95, 97.

Æmilius, 15; death, 16.

Arminius, James, born, 15; father and mother, 15; their death, 15; adopted by Æmilius, 15; adopted by Snellius, 16; at Marburg, 16; journey to Oudewater, 16; walk to Marburg, 16; at Rotterdam with Peter Bertius, 17; at University of Leyden, 17; teachers, 17; adopted by the merchants of Amsterdam, 17; at Geneva, 18; pupil of Beza, 18; met Uytenbogaert, 18; lecturing at Geneva, 19; attacked Aristotle, 19; at Basle, 19; declined the doctorate, 19; return to Geneva, 19; at Padua, 19; at Rome, 20; called to Amsterdam, 20; denied having favored Rome, 20; ordained, 20; style of preaching, 21; how affected by his visit to Rome, 21; how he came to antagonize Calvinism, 22; employed to controvert Koornhert's book, 24; effect upon himself, 24; lecture on Romans ix, 25; effect of his sermons, 25; mental and spiritual exercises, 25; marriage to Elizabeth Real, 25; mode of interpreting "For we know that the law is spiritual," 26; various false charges against him, 27;

before the ministers of Amsterdam, 28; Peter Plau cius against him, 28; Arminius's defense, 29; cleared, 29; Lydius and Uytenbogaert attempt harmony, 29; senators of Amsterdam hear Arminius, 29; Brandt's account, 30; vindicated, and free to preach, 31; a professor at Leyden, 33; released at Amsterdam, 33; oppressed by Calvinist ministers, 33; calm amid the opposition, 35; made a doctor and invested with the office, 36; examination, 36; disputation, 36; his purpose as to his work, 37; three orations, 37; his enemies take advantage of his presence at a discussion, 38; besieged with the question of predestination, 39; falsely called a Pelagian, 39; his charge against Beza and Gomarus, 40; made rector of Leyden University, 40; demonstrated belief in Providence, 42; ready for debate, 43; always advocated salvation free for all men, 43; lectures on Jonah and Malachi, 44; resigned the rectorship, 44; oration on religious dissension, 44; prompt compliance with the Gorcum Synod, 47; interpretations of the confession, 47; endured affliction, 48; visited Hippolytus, 49; drew up a statement of his doctrines, 49; reply to Borrius, 49; declaration of sentiments, 49; death, 50; character, 50; motto, 50; words at The Hague, 103; reasons for opposing predestination, 103-109.

Amsterdam, burgomeisters adopt Arminius, 18; they called Arminius from Geneva, 20; hear charges against Arminius, 29; decision of the senators, 31.

Assembly of West Holland and Friesland voted against Arminianism, 70; Schaff's remarks, 70.

Alva, 53, 145; the butcher, 146; angry, 147; Alva's tax, 148; threatened to hang eighteen men of Brussels, 148; States ordered to assemble at The Hague, but meet at Dort, 149.

Amyraut, 127; professor of Theology at Bourgueil, 127; difference between objective and subjective grace, 128.

Articles of religion of Church of England not Arminian, 131.
Age of theological revolt, 136.
Assembly of Holland and William unite, 150.
Albinus, 152.
Anne, the Queen, 157.
Arminian Magazine, 165.

BARNEVELDT, JOHN, 34; Advocate-General of Holland, 53; advocated Arminianism, 64; executed, 71.
Borrius, Adrian, 49.
Baxterianism, 114.
Boerhave, 152.
Barclay's Apology, 204; rejected Calvinism, 203; true Church Divinity, 205.
Bertius, Peter, 36.
Burgomeister Benning, favored Episcopius, 53.
Bohler, Peter, 130.
Baro, Peter, 132; professor at Cambridge, 132.
Beggars of the Sea, 148.
Brill, 149.
Blois, William de, 149.

CALVINISM, dominant in Holland, 8; questioned the right of any to doubt, 9; Geneva, 9; Scotland, 9; England, 9; New England, 9; necessitated will, 11; modification in Calvinism, 101.
Calvin, John, united Augustinism and Gottschalkism, 98; his Institutes, 13, 99; genius of Calvin, 101.
College in Amsterdam, 83.
Collibus, 48.
Copleston's words, 115.
Cox, 136.
Crucius, 36.
Counter-remonstrants, 65.
Curcellæus, born, 75; entered the Genevese Stoa, 75; student of Beza, 75; letter of commendation from

Geneva, 76; travels, 76; ordained, 77; pastor at Fontainebleau, 77; revolt from Calvinism, 77; pastor at Amiens, 77; refused the Canons of Dort, 77; pastor at Verres, 78; at Amsterdam, 78; Poelenburg's estimate of Curcellæus, 78; successor of Episcopius as professor of Divinity at Amsterdam, 81; death, words of triumph, 82, 86.

Charles V, 142; abdicated, 143.

Campbell's Puritan in Holland, 143.

Chartered cities, 145.

Council of Troubles, 146.

Council of Blood, 146.

Court of St. Cloud, 146.

Coligny slain, 150.

Calvinistic Methodists in three sects, 175.

Clarke, Dr. Adam, an Arminian writer, 193.

Conclusions, 197.

Charles II and Barclay's Apology, 206.

DEPUTIES OF HOLLAND arranging for a preliminary Synod, 48.

Doctrines rejected by Arminius, 68, 69.

Dutch Republic, 142.

Drusus, 152.

EPISCOPIUS, SIMON, 52; professor of Theology at Leyden, 52; his name Bisschop, 53; pupil of Beckemanus, 54; adopted and educated by the Senate of Amsterdam, 54; placed in University of Leyden, 54; made Master of Arts, 54; Theological studies under Arminius, 54; preached before the Senate of Amsterdam, 54; called "The Dutch Cicero," 55; appointed court preacher, 55; relations with Barneveldt, 55; Institutes, 83; principles upon which he lectured, 83, 86.

England's condition as seen by Hallam, 134.

English divines favorable to Arminians, 137.

Elizabeth, 147.
Evans, Thomas, account of the Friends' doctrine, 206.
Elements of a revival, 211.
FIVE POINTS and Five Articles, 64; laid before the Assembly of Representatives, 64; written by Uytenbogaert, 64.
Fletcher's estimate of Bishop Laud, 134; Fletcher, 181; educated, 182; a soldier, 182; in England and with Methodist societies, 182; a priest, 182; rector, 182; Benson's description of him, 182; as a controversialist, 183; statement of Arminianism, 183; answer to Toplady, 184; statement as to how Arminianism esteems grace and justice, 186; essays on Bible Calvinism and Bible Arminianism, 187; Fletcher's argument, 188.
Fisk's Calvinistic controversy, 195; unmasking the "New Divinity," 197.
Fox, founder of the Friends, 201; an Arminian, 201.
Friends, or Quakers, 201; their new creed, 207.
Finney, Rev. Charles G., in a revival, 218.
GROTIUS, HUGO, 50; scholarship, 53; birth, 60; at University of Leyden, 60; his Latin poem to Henry IV of France, 60; visit to Paris, 60; a lawyer, 60; a litterateur, 60; pensioner of Rotterdam, 61; with Cassaubon in England, 61; embraced Arminianism, 61; for toleration, 61; eloquent, 62; arrested, placed in Loewenstein, 62; wife helped him to escape, 63; fled to France, 63; died at Rostock, 63, 87.
Godfrey, 76.
Guilds of Netherlands, 144.
Gerard, the assassin of William of Orange, 153.
Gomarus, 33; oration in honor of Junius, 33; opposition to Arminius, 34; examined Arminius, 36; uncivil towards Arminius, 38; seen by a committee at Leyden, 47.

Gonda, discussion, 45.
Grevinchovius, 36.
Gottschalk, 13, 97; his system, 98; theory of Gottschalk and Augustine united by Calvin, 98.
Geneva school, 18.
Gorcum Synod, 46, 47.
Greek Fathers, effect when read in England, 137.

HUME's statement of the Arminian controversy, 125.
Hallam's estimate of England's Constitution, 134.
Holland, 141; rising hope, 151.
Haarlem and its butchery, 151.
Howell Harris, 173.
Huntingdon, Countess of, 174.
Hodge's erroneous statements, 14; sermons, 92.
Hominius, 36, 41.
Helmichius, 39.
Hoorn, 45.
Halsberg, confidant of Arminius, 47.
Hippolytus à Collibus, 48; received Arminius, 49.
Hagenbach's words, 86.
Historical review of theological conditions, 94.
Hoard, Samuel, rector of Moreton College, 133.

"ICE BIRD," 92.

JUNIUS, FRANCIS, death, 32.
Jesuits, free-will advocates, 126.
Jansenists, predestination advocates, 126.
Jewell, 138.
James I of England, control of Synod of Dort, 136.

KOORNHERT, RICHARD, 22; Secretary of State of Holland, 23; his book, 23; whom he attacked, 24; Lydius appointed to refute the book, 24.
Kuchlinas, 39.
Kurtz's misunderstanding of Arminianism, 179.

LUTHER, 74, 98 ; controversy with Erasmus changed his belief in predestination, 116.

LeClerc, 84.

Limborch, 84, 86 ; life and career, 120 ; student at Utrecht, 121 ; pastor at Gonda, 121 ; professor of Divinity, 121 ; Staudlein's estimate, 121 ; Divinity, 123 ; a commentator, 122 ; Kitto's estimate, 122 ; his *Theologia Christiana*, 123 ; Book of Limborch's distinction between Arminianism and Calvinism, 123.

Lutherans tended to Arminianism, 128.

Lydius, 29.

Lansbergius, 39.

Leyden University astir over Arminius, 41.

Lambeth Articles, object, 137 ; Whitgift's approval, 137 ; Lord Burleigh's disapproval, 137.

Louis of Nassau, 149 ; at Mons, 149.

Leyden taken by Orange, 151 ; university founded, 152.

Lipsius, 152.

Leyden and Protestants from France, 152.

Laud and Juxon, 133 ; Fletcher's estimate of Laud, 134.

Low countries, 141.

MEDENBLICK, 45.

Mosheim's remarks on Arminianism, 71.

Melanchthon, 74, 98 ; his *Loci Theologici*, 116.

Moravians, or Zinzendorfians, 129.

Mennonites, 129 ; antedated Arminius, 130.

Menno Simons, 130.

Margaret of Parma, 145.

Marck, William de la, at Brill, 149.

Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, 150.

Middleburgh, victory at, 151.

Moody, D. L., in a revival, 219.

NATIONAL SYNOD, question of, 44 ; demand for, 45 ; ordered, 45 ; work, 45 ; questions that arose, 46 ; Reformed pastors opposed revision, 46 ; Arminius and

Uytenbogaert favored revision, 46; Synodical letters, 47.

Næranus and his wife, 88.

Nitschmann, 130.

Nowell, 138.

Netherlands, 141.

Nonjuring Presbyterians, 157.

ORIGINAL SIN, 12.

PLAUCIUS, 29.

Pestilence in Holland, 32.

Poelenburg's funeral oration, 78; a professor, 84.

Persecutions at Leyden, 89.

Persons making a cloak of Arminianism, 112.

Pelagianism founded no societies, 95; contact with Arminianism, 113.

Pelagius the Monk of Wales, 96; at Hippo, 97.

Pope's statements, 96; Systematic Theology, 192.

Predestinarianism leading to Pantheism, 100; predestination, first form, 103-109; second form, 109.

Pre-Wesleyan Arminianism of the Continent, 126.

Playfere, John, 132; professor at Cambridge, 132; Baker's remarks about him, 132.

Peter Paaw, 152.

Puritanism strong in the Netherlands, 133.

Protest of a Cameronian against Arminianism, 157.

Political home of Arminianism, 139.

Puritanism and Arminianism, 140; the two contrasted, 140.

Philip II, 142; ruler of the Netherlands, 143; cruel, 145.

Prince of Condé, 147.

Penn and Pennington, 202.

RAMUS, 19.

Remonstrants and Counter Remonstrants, 65.

Revolt of Arminius and Episcopius, 74.

Remonstrants' College at Amsterdam, 83; professors, 84.
Ryckewart, 88.
Requesens, Louis de, in place of Alva, 151.
Raymond's Systematic Theology, 194.
Revivals and Arminianism, 209; a revival and its two parts, 210; elements of a revival, 211; revival in a college town, 215; Calvinists in a revival surrender their peculiar doctrine, 217.

SYNOD OF DORT, 8-12.

Second class of Arminian writers, 73.
Schleiermacher's views of Arminianism, 85.
Synod of South Holland, 46.
Socinus in Poland, 95.
Sovereignty of God absolute, 100; unconditional, 100.
Scholars of Arminianism, 179.
Sublapsarianism, 111.
Socinianism, 111, 112.
Supralapsarianism, 114.
Sacramental controversy, effect upon Arminianism, 128.
Sandys, 136.
States Assemblies and Alva's tax, 148.
St. Bartholomew's Day, 150.
Separation between Wesley and Whitefield, 167.
Shirley, 174.

TRELCATIUS, 47.

The Hague, preliminary Synod, 48; Arminius presented a Declaration of Sentiments to the Synod of The Hague, 49.
Treatment of banished preachers, 87.
Theological revolt, age of, 136.
Theological teaching when John Wesley came, 138.
Title of London Church property, 167.
Toplady, 175.
Trevecca, 175.

UNIVERSALISM, 10 ; no human will in salvation, 10.
Unitas Fratrum, 129.
United Netherlands, 142.
Uytenbogaert, 19, 29 ; intercedes for Arminius, 33, 34 ; preacher at The Hague, and chaplain to Prince Maurice, 52 ; defended Arminianism, 56 ; leader of the Remonstrants, 56 ; born in Utrecht, 56 ; pastor at Utrecht, 56 ; personal appearance, 57 ; opposed compulsory support of symbols, 57 ; his demand of the State, 57 ; his influence, 57 ; the State invoked against him, 58 ; sought for toleration, 58 ; his colloquy at The Hague, 58 ; president of the Synod of Wallevick, 59 ; arrested at Antwerp and banished to Rouen, 59 ; secret return, 59 ; part of his goods restored, 59 ; liberties curtailed, 59 ; death, 59 ; author of the Five Articles, 64.
Utrecht refused Alva's tax, 148.

VAN CATTENBURGH, 85.
Van Oosterzee and Arminianism, 86.
Voetius, Gysburtius, erroneous teachings, 124 ; a student at Leyden, 124 ; character, 124.
Vorstius, Conrad, born, 125 ; educated, 125 ; professor at Steinfurt, 125 ; expelled by order of James I of England, 125.
Van der Does, 152.
Vossius, 152.

WILL, necessitated, 11 ; freedom of will, 11.
Wettstein, 85.
Writers, modern, regarding Arminianism, 85.
Winer and Arminianism, 86.
Warren, Dr. W. F., statement, 102.
Words of Arminius, 103.
Watson, an Arminian writer, 114 ; theology constructed on the Arminian basis, 189.
Wesley and Arminianism, 119, 158.

William of Orange, 146; The Silent, 146; made Stadholder, 147; defeated, 147; fled to France, 147; believed himself a man of destiny, 150; assassinated, 153.

Wesleyan Arminianism a Reformation, 158.

Wesley's letter to his mother, 159; his mother's reply, 159; Mrs. Wesley's letter from Wroote, 160; sermon on "Free Grace," 161; eight reasons for antagonizing predestination, 161-163; Wesley's Dialogue, 163; four reasons against predestination, 163-164; in the light, 164; a logician and organizer, 168; letter to Whitefield, 169, 172; letter of 1747 to Whitefield regarding a union of Methodist societies, 176.

Whitefield, a friend of Wesley, 167; an impulsive man, 168; orator, 168; visit to America, 169; letter to Wesley, 169; second voyage to America, 170; letter from Savannah, 170; letter from Lopen, 170; historical fact, letter to Hutton, 171; imploring Wesley not to speak against election, 171; letters to Wesley from South Carolina, 172; letter from Boston, 172; return to England, 177; not well received in Scotland, 177.

Welsh Calvinistic Methodists, 174.

Whedon and the *Review*, 194; freedom of the will on an Arminian basis, 195.

ZARABELLA, 19

Zwingli, 74, 99.

Zinzendorf, 129.

331690
THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.



THE WITNESS OF THE WORLD TO CHRIST.

By REV. W. A. MATHEWS, M. A.

12mo. Cloth. 240 pages, 90 cents.

"We all, whether students of natural or revealed truth, are groping our onward way to perfect light, and whatsoever doth make manifest aught that to either is yet dark, is light that we well may hail, even if its rays penetrate to us from without the chamber of our own special study."

"This is a valuable and suggestive work by a minister of the Church of England. It is well adapted to meet some current forms of skepticism, and to strengthen faith in the divine character of the Christian religion. . . . He maintains that Christianity is not merely one of the religions of the world, but a new life!"—*Christian Guardian*.

THE MASTER SOWER.

By REV. F. S. DAVIS, A. M.

12mo. Cloth. 196 pages, 75 cents.

"The principles of the Christian religion are strikingly like principles of germination and growth in material nature. Christian truths germinate, grow, and multiply in a single soul, and in the souls of the human race *en masse*."

"An original, suggestive, and well-written book."—*Northern Christian Advocate*.

"In this volume the author gives a natural, common-sense exposition and practical application of the Parable of the Sower. . . . The book is well written, and will provide interesting and profitable reading for the candid and thoughtful."—*Religious Telescope*.

HUNT & EATON, New York, Boston, Pittsburg, San Francisco.



VOX DEI:

The Doctrine of the Spirit as it is set forth in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

By R. A. REDFORD, M. A., LL. D.

12mo. Cloth. 344 pages, \$1 00

"The specific want of such an age as the present, when speculation is rife and opinions clash, while at the same time extraordinary activity is aroused; when, because we think and work at high pressure in all departments of human life, we are tempted to be superficial and too easily caught by novelty,—our greatest demand must be for materials wherewith to build up solid structures of faith."

"The work before us is thoroughly Scriptural. Its appeal is to the Word of God, and it is needless to say that the conclusions reached are thoroughly orthodox. It is an excellent treatise on a vital subject, and should be widely read."—*Pittsburg Christian Advocate*.

GENESIS I AND MODERN SCIENCE.

By CHAS. B. WARING, PH. D.

12mo. Cloth. 245 pages, \$1 00

"Can it be bettered? Nay, is it possible to make the slightest change in it without the most serious consequences to what we call science? Instead of a blunder, there is here proof of the omniscience of the author of this account, the more marvelous because, until lately, it seemed just the opposite."

"This is a vigorous and able vindication of the harmony existing between modern science and the account of the origin and early molding of the universe recorded in the first chapter of Genesis. The argument is presented in the guise of conversations on successive evenings between the author and an objecting "professor," who is the advocate of an irreconcilable disagreement between science and the Biblical account of creation."—*U. B. Quarterly Review*.

CRANSTON & CURTS, Cincinnati, Chicago, St. Louis.

BX
6195
8

Curtiss, George Lewis, 1835-1898.

Arminianism in history; or the revolt from predestinationism. Cincinnati, Cranston & Curts, 1894.

237p. 20cm.

Bibliography: p. 221-226.

1. Arminianism. I. Title.

331690

CCSC

